

A STUDY of ACCOMMODATION MOVEMENTS between
PRESBYTERY and EPISCOPACY in the SEVENTEENTH
CENTURY in SCOTLAND, ENGLAND and IRELAND.

A THESIS for the DEGREE of

DOCTOR of PHILOSOPHY

submitted by

The REVEREND D.S. HOPKIRK,

M.A.(Edin.), B.D.(Edin.), B.Litt.(Oxon.).

C O N T E N T S.

Sources and Bibliography.

	Page.
1. Scotland	i.
2. England	viii.
3. Ireland	xii.

PART I.

S C O T L A N D.

Chap.		Page.
I.	A Question of Origins - Moderate Episcopacy.	1.
II.	The Policy of Charles I.	16.
III.	The National Covenant of 1638.	29.
IV.	The Glasgow General Assembly of 1638	42.
V.	The Solemn League and Covenant of 1643	48.
VI.	Montrose. The Engagement	60.
VII.	Cromwell. The Commonwealth and the Protectorate	73.
VIII.	The Restoration	83.
IX.	Accommodation Prospects	97.
X.	The Persecution	109.
XI.	The Peace Policy	121.
XII.	The Accommodation Movement	134.
XIII.	The Leighton Accommodation	147.
XIV.	Accommodation and the Revolution Settlement... ..	174.

PART II.
E N G L A N D.

Chap.		Page.
	XV. Early English Presbyterianism.	185.
1604	XVI. The Hampton Court Conference and Reynolds' Accommodation... ..	197.
1641	XVII. Charles I. The Falkland and Williams Schemes	204.
1642	XVIII. The Uxbridge and Isle of Wight Accommodations.	217.
	XIX. The Westminster Assembly and Accommodation ...	235.
	XX. The English Accommodationist Thinkers ...	244.
	XXI. Baxter's Effort - The Voluntary Associations	268.
1660	XXII. The Restoration. The Worcester House Declaration and Accommodation	288.
1662	XXIII. The Wilkins and Burton Accommodation ...	306.
	XXIV. Tillotson, Stillingfleet and Baxter - 1675	318.
	XXV. 1689 - The Great Accommodation	325.

PART III.
I R E L A N D.

	XXVI. Presbytery in Episcopacy. The Early Presbyterian Church of Ireland	345.
	XXVII. The Case of Robert Blair	355.
	XXVIII. The Episcopal Church of Ireland	362.
	XXIX. Wentworth	372.
	XXX. The Cromwellian Period and the Associations...	379.

Chap.		Page.
XXXI.	The Restoration and the Revolution	389.
XXXII.	Athanasius Hibernicus - John Bramhall ...	402.
XXXIII.	Jeremy Taylor - The Liberty of Propheasing..	418.
XXXIV.	James Ussher - 1641	436.
XXXV.	James Ussher - 1648	454.

SOURCES and BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. SCOTLAND.

(a) Older Works and Sources.

1. Aberdeen, Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of. Selections from the Records. 1562-1681. Spalding Club. MDCCLXVI.
2. Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. 1638-1642. Edited by T. Pitcairn.
3. Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland. 2 Vols. Bannatyne Club. Edinburgh. 1839.
4. Acts Parl. Scot. Vols. II. and III.
5. Acts of Parliament of Scotland. Edited by Thomas Thomson. Vols. VII. and VIII.
6. Argyll, Archibald, Earl of. Letters to John, Duke of Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. 1829.
7. Argyle Papers. Edited by J. Maidment. Edinburgh. 1834.
8. Baillie of Jerviswoode, George. Correspondence. Edinburgh. 1842.
9. Baillie, Robert. Letters and Journals. 1637-1662. 3 Vols. 1841-1842. Bannatyne Club.
10. Balfour, Sir James. Annals of Scotland. 4 Vols. Edinburgh. 1824.
11. Blackadder, J. Memoirs. Edited by Crichton. Edinburgh. 1823.
12. Brodie, Alexander. Diary. Aberdeen. 1863.
13. Brown, J. History of the Indulgence.
14. Burnet, Bishop G. History of his own Times. Oxford. 1833.
15. Burnet, Bishop G. Lives of James and William, Dukes of Hamilton. Oxford. 1852.
16. Calderwood, D. The History of the Kirk of Scotland. 8 Vols. 1514-1625. Edited by Rev. Thomas Thompson. 1842-1849.
17. Cameron of Locheill, Sir Ewen. Memoirs. Edinburgh. MDCCLXII. Abbotsford Club.
18. Carstairs' State Papers.
19. Clarendon. History of the Rebellion. 6 Vols. 1888.
20. Clarke Papers. Vol. IV. Edited by C.H. Firth. Royal Hist. Socy. 1901.
21. Commissions of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland. Records. 1646-1649. 2 Vols. A.F. Mitchell. 1892, 1896.

22. Cunningham of Craigends, William. Diary and General Expenditure Book of. 1673-1680. Edited by J. Dodds. Scottish History Society. Vol. II. Edinburgh. 1887.
23. Dalkeith, Extracts from the Presbytery Books of; also from the Session Records of Newbattle. The Rev. Dr. Gordon, Minister of Newbattle in "Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries". Vol. IV. pp. 459-489.
24. Dalrymple, Sir James. Memoir. A.J.G. Mackay. 1873.
25. Defoe, Daniel. Memoirs of the Church of Scotland in four periods. Preface and notes by William Wilson. Perth. 1844.
26. Dickson, J. Warning against compliance with the Indulgence.
27. Dunblane, Register of the Diocesan Synod of. Dr. Wilson, Minister of Dunning.
28. Faithful Contendings Displayed.
29. Fife, Selections from the minutes of the Synod of. 1611-1687. Abbotsford Club. MDCCCXXXVII.
30. Firth, C.H. Scotland and the Commonwealth. Letters and Papers relating to the military government of Scotland. 1651-1653. Scottish History Society. 1894.
31. Firth, C.H. Scotland and the Protectorate. Letters and Papers relating to the military government of Scotland. 1654-1659. Scottish History Society. 1898.
32. Forbes of Corse, John. The First Book of the Irenicum. E.G. Selwyn.
33. Foulis of Ravelston, Sir John. Account Book. 1671-1707. Edited by A.W.C. Hallen. Scottish History Society. 1894.
34. Frasers, Chronicles of the. The Wardlaw Manuscript. James Fraser, minister of the Parish of Wardlaw. Edited by William Mackay. Scottish History Society. Edinburgh. 1905.
35. Gardiner, S.R. Letters and Papers illustrating the relations between Charles II. and Scotland in 1650. Scottish History Society. 1893.
36. Gordon, James. History of Scots affairs. 1637-1641. Spalding Club. 1, 3 and 5. Aberdeen. 1841.
37. Gordon, General Patrick, Passages from the Diary of. 1635-1699. Aberdeen. MDCCCLIX.
38. Guthry, Henry, Bishop of Dunkeld. Memoirs. Glasgow. 1748.
39. Hamilton Papers. 1638-1650. Edited by S.R. Gardiner. Camden Society. 1880.
40. Hay of Craignethan, Andrew. Diary. 1659-1660. Edited by A.G. Reid. Scottish History Society. 1901.
41. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports.
42. Hodgson, Captain. Memoirs. Edited by Sir Walter Scott. Edinburgh. 1806.
43. Hope of Craighall, Bart., Sir Thomas, Diary of the public correspondence of. 1633-1645. Bannatyne Club. 1843.
44. Howie. Scots Worthies.

45. Inverness and Dingwall, Extracts from the Presbytery Records of. 1638-1688. Edited by William Mackay. Scottish History Society. 1896.
46. James VI., Letters and State Papers during the reign of. Abbotsford Club. 1838.
47. Keith, Bishop. Register.
48. Kerr, Robert, first Earl of Ancrum. Correspondence of Sir R. Kerr and his son William, third Earl of Lothian. 2 Vols. Edited by D. Laing. Edinburgh. 1875.
49. Kirkton, John. The Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland. Edited by C.K. Sharpe. Edinburgh. 1817.
50. Knox, John. Works. Edited by Laing. 6 Vols. 1895.
51. Lamont of Newton, John. Diary. 1649-1672. Maitland Club. 1830.
52. Lanark, Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of. MDCXXIII-MDCCIX. Edinburgh. Abbotsford Club. MDCCCXXXIX.
53. Lauder of Fountainhall, Sir John. Chronological Notices of Scottish affairs. 1680-1701. Edited by Sir W. Scott. Edinburgh. 1822.
54. Lauder of Fountainhall, Sir John. Historical Notices of Scottish Affairs. 1661-1688. 2 Vols. 1848.
55. Lauder of Fountainhall, Sir John. Historical Observes of Memorable Occurrents in Church and State. 1680-1686. Edinburgh. 1840.
56. Lauder of Fountainhall, Sir John. Journals with his observations on public affairs. 1665-1676. Edited by Donald Crawford. Scottish History Society. Edinburgh. 1900.
57. Lauderdale Papers. Edited by Osmund Airy. 3 Vols. Camden Society. 1884.
58. Lauk, William. Episcopal Innocence. London. 1694.
59. Law, Robert. Memorials; or, the memorable things that fell out within this island of Brittain from 1638 to 1684. Edinburgh. 1818.
60. Leighton's Works. William West's Edition. 1869-1875. This is the edition quoted in the thesis.
Sermons by Robert Leighton quoted as Vol. II.
Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter, Part I.,
quoted as Vol. III.
Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter, Part II.,
quoted as Vol. IV.
Expository Lectures quoted as Vol. V.
University Lectures quoted as Vol. VI.
Remains quoted as Vol. VII.
61. Leighton, Robert. Life and Letters. D. Butler. 1903.
62. Leighton-Burnet Papers. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Edinburgh. 1904. Vol. II. 1648-168-. Edited by H.C. Foxcroft.
63. Leven and Melville Papers.

64. Mackenzie, Sir George. Memoirs of affairs of Scotland from the restoration of Charles II. Edinburgh. 1821.
65. Macpherson, James. Original papers, containing the secret history of Great Britain from the Restoration to the accession of the house of Hanover. Vol. I. London. 1775.
66. McWard, R. Earnest Contendings for the Faith.
67. Melros, Thomas, Earl of. State Papers and Miscellaneous Correspondence. Edinburgh. MDCCCXXXVII.
68. Monteith, Robert. History of the Troubles of Great Britain. 1633-1650. London. 1735.
69. De Montereuil, Correspondence of. 1645-1648. Edited by J.G. Fotheringham. 2 Vols. Edinburgh. 1897.
70. "Naphtali". A True and Short Deduction of the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland.
71. Nicoll, John. Diary. Bannatyne Club. 1836.
72. Nimmo, Mr. J., Narrative of. Written 1654-1709. Edited by W.G. Scott-Moncrieff. Scottish History Society. Vol. VI. Edinburgh. 1889.
73. Oldmixon. Memoirs of North Britain. London. 1715.
74. Peterkin, Alexander. Records of the Kirk of Scotland, containing the proceedings of the General Assemblies from 1638. Edinburgh. 1838-1840.
75. Renwick, James. Collection of Sermons "preached on the mountains and muirs of Scotland in the hottest time of the late Persecution". 1749.
76. Rothes, Earl of. Relation of Proceedings concerning the Affairs of the Kirk of Scotland from August 1637 to July 1638. Bannatyne Club. 1830.
77. Roundhead Officers, Letters from. Written from Scotland. 1650-1660. Bannatyne Club. 1856.
78. Row, John. History of the Kirk of Scotland. 1558-1637. (Part I.). Part II. 1637-1639. Edinburgh. 1842.
79. Row. Memoirs of Blair. Wodrow Society Publications.
80. Rushworth, John. Historical Collections. 1618-1648. 8 Vols. London. 1682-1701.
81. St. Andrews and Cupar, Selections from the minutes of the Presbyteries of. Ecclesiastical Records. MDCXLI-MDCXCVIII. Edinburgh. MDCCCXXXVII. Abbotsford Club.
82. St. Andrews, Kirk Session of. D.H. Fleming. Scottish History Society. Vols. IV, VII. Edinburgh. 1889.
83. Scot, William. Apologetical Relation of the State of the Kirk of Scotland. Edinburgh. 1846.
84. Sermons in Times of Persecution. Edited by Kerr.
85. Shields, Alexander. A Hind Let Loose. 1687.
86. Shields, Alexander. Life of Renwick. Edinburgh. 1827.
87. Shields, Alexander. Narration of his Sufferings. 1715.
88. Spalding, John. History of the troubles in Scotland. 1624-1645. Edinburgh. 1828-1829.
89. State Papers, Calendar of. Domestic Series. 1660-1695.
90. Strathbogie, Extracts from the Presbytery Book of. MDCXXXI-MDCLIV. Aberdeen. Spalding Club. 1843.

91. Strathmore, Patrick, First Earl of. The Book of Record; a diary and other documents relating to Glamis Castle. 1684-1689. Edited by A.H. Millar. Scottish History Society. 1890.
92. Terry, C.S. Papers relating to the army of the Scottish League and Covenant. 1643-1647. 1917.
93. Thurloe, John. A Collection of State Papers. 1638-1660. London. 1742.
94. Turner, Sir James. Memoirs of his own time. 1632-1670. Edinburgh. 1829.
95. Tweedie, W.K. Wodrow. Select Biographies. 2 Vols. Edinburgh. 1845-1847.
96. Veitch and Brysson, Memoirs of. Edited by McCrie.
97. Walker, Patrick. Biographia Presbyteriana. London. 1901.
98. Warriston's Diary and other Papers. Scottish History Society. 1896.
99. Wigton Papers. Miscellany of Maitland Club. Vol. II. 1840.
100. Wishart, George. Memoirs of James, Marquis of Montrose. London. 1893.
101. Wodrow, R. The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution. Edited by Rev. Robert Burns. Glasgow. 1830.

(b) More Modern Works.

1. Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society, Transactions of the. Vol. I. 1886-1889. Aberdeen.
2. Antiquaries of Scotland, Transactions of the Society of. Vol. II. Edinburgh. MDCCCXXII.
3. Aiton, J. Life and Times of Alexander Henderson. 1583-1646. Edinburgh. 1836.
4. Bannatyne Miscellany. Vol. III. 1855.
5. Bibliographical Society, Papers of the Edinburgh. 1890-1895. Edinburgh. MDCCCXCVI.
6. Biography, Dictionary of National.
7. Biscoe, A.C. Earls of Middleton, Lords of Clermont and of Fettercairn. London. 1876.
8. Blaikie, W.G. Evangelical Succession. 2nd Series. Edinburgh. 1883.
9. Blunt, J.H. Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology. Second Edition. MDCCCLXXII.
10. Brown, P. Hume. History of Scotland. Vol. II. 1905.
11. Buchan Field Club. 1887-1890. Vol. I.
12. Carlyle, Thomas. Cromwell's Letters and Speeches. London. 1845.
13. Carslaw, W.H. Donald Cargill. Paisley. 1900.
14. Carslaw, W.H. William Guthrie. Paisley. 1900.

15. Carslaw, W.H. James Renwick. Paisley. 1900.
16. Carter, C.S. The English Church in the Seventeenth Century.
17. Clarke, T.E.S. Life of Gilbert Burnet. Cambridge. 1907.
18. Cunningham, John. Church History of Scotland. Vol. II. 1882.
19. Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society. No. 6 and No. 17.
20. Fleming, D.H. Covenanting Testimonies. Edinburgh. 1911.
21. Fleming, D.H. Some subscribed copies of the Solemn League and Covenant. Edinburgh. 1918.
22. Fleming, D.H. Story of the Scottish Covenants. Edinburgh. 1904.
23. Fleming, D.H. James VI. 1902.
24. Gardiner, S.R. History of England. 1603-1659.
25. Grub, George. Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. 4 Vols. Edinburgh. 1861.
26. Hastings. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Various Articles.
27. Hawick Archaeological Society. Transactions. 1864.
28. Hetherington, W.M. History of the Church of Scotland. Edinburgh. 1843.
29. Hewison, J.K. The Covenanters. Vol. II. 1913.
30. Historical Review, Scottish. Various Volumes.
31. History Society, Miscellany of the Scottish. Vol. I. Edinburgh. 1893. Vol. II. 1904.
32. Inverness Scientific Society and Field Club, Transactions of the. Vol. IV. 1888-1895. Inverness.
33. Johnston, J.C. Treasury of the Scottish Covenant. 1887.
34. Kinloch, M.G.J. Studies in ecclesiastical (Scottish) history in the 17th and 18th centuries. Edinburgh. 1898.
35. Lang, Andrew. History of Scotland. 1900.
36. Macgregor, Janet G. Scottish Presbyterian Polity. 1926.
37. Mackenzie, W.C. John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale. Life and Times of. 1616-1682. London. 1923.
38. Mackinnon, James. A History of Modern Liberty. Vol. III. 1908.
39. Maitland Club, Miscellany of. Vol. I. 1834. Vol. IV. Part I. 1847.
40. Masson, David. Life of Milton. 6 Vols. 1859-1880.
41. Mathieson, W.L. Politics and Religion. Scottish History from the Reformation to the Revolution. 2 Vols. Glasgow. 1902.
42. Mitchell, Anthony. Short History of the Church in Scotland. Oxford Church Text Books. London. 1907.
43. Morison, W. Johnston of Warriston. Famous Scots Series. Edinburgh. 1901.
44. Morris, Mowbray. Montrose. English Men of Action. London. 1892.

45. Napier, Mark. Life and Times of Montrose. Edinburgh.
1840.
46. Napier, Mark. Memoirs of Marquis of Montrose. 2 Vols.
Edinburgh. 1856.
47. Napier, Mark. Memorials and Letters illustrative of the
Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse. 3 Vols.
Edinburgh. 1859-1862.
48. Notes and Queries. Vol. I.
49. Ollard, S.L. and Cresse, Gordon. Dictionary of English
Church History. 1912.
50. Perth, Transactions of the Literary and Antiquarian Society
of. Vol. I. 1827.
51. Provand, W.S. Puritanism in the Scottish Church. Hastie
Lectures.
52. Pullan, Leighton. Religion since the Reformation.
53. Pullan, Leighton. The Christian Tradition.
54. Reid, H.M.B. Divinity Professors of the University of
Glasgow. 1640-1903. 1923.
55. Spalding Club, Miscellany of the. Vol. I. 1841.
Vol. II. 1842. Vol. III. 1846.
56. Spottiswoode Miscellany. Vol. II. MDCCCXLV.
57. Stirling Natural History and Archaeological Society.
Transactions. 1898-1899. Stirling. 1899.
58. Story, R.H. William Carstares. 1874.
59. Terry, C.S. History of Scotland. Cambridge. 1920.
60. Terry, C.S. John Graham of Claverhouse. 1905.
61. Terry, C.S. Life of Alexander Leslie. London. 1899.
62. Terry, C.S. The Pentland Rising. Fullion Green.
Glasgow. 1905.
63. Walker, James. The Theology and Theologians of Scotland,
chiefly of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.
64. Willcock, J. Life and Times of Archibald, 8th Earl of
Argyll. Edinburgh. 1903.

SOURCES and BIBLIOGRAPHY.

II. ENGLAND.

(a) Older Works and Sources.

1. Aubrey, John. Brief Lives. 1669-1696. Andrew Clark. 2 Vols. 1898.
2. Baillie, Robert. Letters and Journals. Edited David Laing. 3 Vols. 1841-42.
3. Bancroft, Richard. Dangerous Positions and Proceedings published and practised within this Island of Britain under pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbyterial Discipline. 1593.
4. Barlow, William. The Summe and Substance of the Conference, which, it pleased his Excellent Majestie to have with the Lords Bishops in his Majesties Privie-Court, at Hampton Court January 14, 1603. 1605.
5. Baxter, Richard. Works. William Orme. 23 Vols. 1830. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Baxter's Narrative of the most memorable passages of his Life and Times. Matthew Sylvester. MDCXCVI.
6. Birch, Thomas. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. MDCCLII.
7. Brook, B. The Lives of the Puritans to 1662. 3 Vols. 1813.
8. Calamy, Edmund. An Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of his Life and Times. 2nd Ed. 2 Vols. 1713.
9. Calamy, Edmund and Palmer, Samuel. The Nonconformist's Memorial. 3 Vols. 1802.
10. Calendar of State Papers. Domestic.
11. Cardwell, Edward. A History of Conferences. 2nd Ed. MDCCCXLI.
12. Cardwell, Edward. Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England. 2 Vols. MDCCCXXXIX.
13. Clarendon. History of the Rebellion. In 7 Vols. Oxford Edition.
14. Clarendon State Papers.
15. Commons' Journals.
16. Cromwell, Oliver. Letters and Speeches. Edited Thomas Carlyle. 3 Vols. Ashburton Edition.
17. D'Oyley, George. Life of Sancroft. 2nd Ed. 1840.
18. Evelyn, John. Diary. Newnes Edition.
19. Gillespie, George. Notes of Debates and Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines and other Commissioners at Westminster. February 1644 to January 1645. Edited David Meek. 1846.

20. Hacket, John. *Scrinia Reserata: A Memorial offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams, D.D.* 1692.
21. Hetherington, W.M. *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.* 1843.
22. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports.
23. Hooker, Richard. *Works.* Arranged by Keble. Revised by Church and Paget. 3 Vols. MDCCCLXXXVIII.
24. Kennett, Bishop White. *History of England.* 1706.
25. Kennett, Bishop White. *Register.* 1728.
26. Lightfoot, John. *Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines from Jan. 1, 1643 to Dec. 31, 1644.* In Vol. XIII. pp. 1-344 of his *Whole Works.* Edited J.R. Pitman. 1825.
27. Lords' Journals.
28. Martindale, Adam. *Autobiography.* Printed for the Chetham Society.
29. Neal, Daniel. *History of the Puritans.* 5 Vols. Toulmin's Edition. 1822.
30. Newcome, Henry. *Diary.* Printed for the Chetham Society.
31. Patrick, Bishop Simon. *Autobiography.* New Ed. 1858.
32. Pepys, Samuel. *Diary.* Everyman Edition in 2 Vols.
33. Pope, W. *Life of Seth Ward.* 1697.
34. Heresby, Sir John. *Memoirs.* Edited Cartwright. London. 1875.
35. Reynolds, Edward. *Works and Life by A. Chalmers.* 6 Vols. 1826.
36. Rogers, Henry. *Life and Character of John Howe, M.A.* 1836. Republished 1863.
37. Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections.* 1618-1648. 8 Vols. London. 1682-1701.
38. Shaw, W.A. *Minutes of the Manchester Presbyterian Classis.* 1646-60. 3 pts. Chetham Society. 1890-1891.
39. Soames, Henry. *Elizabethan Religious History.*
40. Stillingfleet, Edward. *Works.* 6 Vols. MDCCX.
41. Stillingfleet, Edward. *Irenicum.* 1661.
The first edition is usually given as 1659, the second edition as 1662. A.A. Seaton, however, in "The Theory of Toleration under the later Stuarts", p. 341, argues for 1661 as the date.
42. Strype, John. *Annals.* Published 1709-1731.
43. Strype, John. *Lives of Parker, 1711; Grindal, 1710; Whitgift, 1718.* 3 Vols.
44. Thoresby, Ralph. *Diary.* 1677-1724. Joseph Hunter. 2 Vols. 1830.
45. Westminster Assembly of Divines, *Minutes of the Sessions of.* (From Nov. 1644 to March, 1649). Mitchell, A.F. and Struthers, John. 1874.
46. Wilkins. *Concilia Magnae Britanniae.* 4 Vols. 1737.
47. Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses.* New edition. Philip Bliss. Vols. II. and III. 1815.
48. Zurich Letters. Parker Society. First Series, 1558-1579. Second Series, 1558-1602. Cambridge. 1842 and 1845.

(b) More Modern Works.

1. Bettenson, Henry. Documents of the Christian Church. 1943.
2. Biography, Dictionary of National. Various Articles.
3. Blaxland, Bruce. The Struggle with Puritanism. 1910.
4. Clark, H.W. History of English Nonconformity. 2 Vols. 1913.
5. Curtis, William A. History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith. 1911.
6. Drysdale, A.H. History of the Presbyterians in England. 1889.
7. Elliott-Binns, L. The Reformation in England. 1937.
8. Francis, J.J. Excerpt from Reliquiae Baxterianae and an Essay by Sir James Stephen on Richard Baxter. 1910.
9. Frere, W.H. The English Church in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. 1558-1625. 1904.
10. Frere, W.H. and Douglas, C.E. Puritan Manifestoes. Ch. Hist. Socy. London. 1907.
11. Fuller, Morris. Life, Letters and Writings of John Davenant, D.D. 1897.
12. Gardiner, S.R. A History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. 1649-1656. 4 Vols.
13. Gardiner, S.R. A History of the Great Civil War. 1642-1649. 4 Vols.
14. Gardiner, S.R. Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution. 1628-1660.
15. Gee, H. and Hardy, W.J. Documents illustrative of English Church History. 1914.
16. Green, J.R. Short History of the English People. Everyman Edition.
17. Gwatkin, H.M. (Editor), The Church, Past and Present. 1900.
18. Hallam, Henry. Constitutional History of England. 1870.
19. Hastings. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Various Articles.
20. Hutton, W.H. The English Church from the accession of Charles I. to the death of Anne. 1625-1714. 1903.
21. M' Crie, Thomas. Annals of English Presbytery. MDCCCLXXII.
22. Marsden, J.B. History of the Early Puritans to 1642. 1850.
23. Marsden, J.B. History of the Later Puritans. 1642-1662. 1852.
24. Mitchell, W. Fraser. English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson. 1932.
25. Molesworth, W.N. History of the Church of England from 1660. 1882.
26. Ollard, S.L. and Crosse, Gordon. A Dictionary of English Church History. 1912.

27. Overton, J.H. Life in the English Church. 1660-1714.
1885.
28. Overton, J.H. The Nonjurors. 1902.
29. Pearson, A.F. Scott. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan
Puritanism. 1535-1603. Cambridge. 1925.
30. Perry, G.G. A History of the English Church from the
Accession of Henry VIII. to the silencing of Convoca-
tion in the eighteenth century. 1878.
31. Powicke, F.J. The Cambridge Platonists. 1926.
32. Powicke, F.J. Life of Richard Baxter. 1924.
33. Prothero, G.W. Statutes and Political Documents.
1558-1625. Oxford. 1898.
34. Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia. 4 Vols. 1891. Various
Articles.
35. Seaton, A.A. The Theory of Toleration under the Later
Stuarts. 1911.
36. Shaw, W.A. History of the English Church during the
Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth. 1640-1660.
2 Vols. 1900.
37. Skeats, H.S. and Miall, C.S. History of the Free Churches
of England. 1688-1891. 1891.
38. Spedding, James. Francis Bacon and His Times. 2 Vols.
London. 1878.
39. Stoughton, John. The Church of the Civil Wars.
The Church of the Commonwealth.
The Church of the Restoration.
The Church of the Revolution.
40. Tatham, G. B. The Puritans in Power. A study in the
history of the English Church from 1640 to 1660.
1913.
41. Tatham, G.B. Dr. John Walker and the Sufferings of the
Clergy. 1911.
42. Turner, J.L. Original Records of Early Nonconformity.
3 Vols. 1911.
43. Vaughan, Robert. History of England under the House of
Stuart, including the Commonwealth. 2 Vols. 1840.
44. Vaughan, Robert. English Nonconformity. MDCCLXII.

SOURCES and BIBLIOGRAPHY.

III. IRELAND.

(a) Older Works and Sources.

1. Adair, Patrick. A True Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. 1623-1670. Introduction and Notes by W.D. Killen. 1866.
2. Aikin, John. Life of Usher. MDCCXXII.
3. Baillie, Robert. Letters and Journals. Edited David Laing. 3 Vols. 1841-42.
4. Bernard, Nicholas. Life of Dr. James Usher. 1656.
5. Biographies, Select. 2 Vols. Wodrow Society. Edited W.K. Tweedie.
6. Blair, Robert. Autobiography. Wodrow Society. Edited Thomas M'Crrie. MDCCOXLVIII.
7. Bramhall, John. Works in Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. MDCCCLII. Particularly Vols. I. and III.
8. Bramhall. Works in one volume. Athanasius Hibernicus. Life prefixed by John Vesey. (unpaged). MDCLXXVII.
9. Brook, B. The Lives of the Puritans to 1662. 3 Vols. 1813.
10. Burnet, Bishop G. History of his own Times. One Vol. Ed. 1883.
11. Burnet, Bishop G. Life of Bedell.
12. Calendar of the Carew MSS.
13. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Ireland.
14. Carte, Thomas. Life of Duke of Ormonde. 3 Vols. MDCCXXXVI.
15. Castlehaven, Earl of. Memoirs. 1815.
16. Clarendon. History of the Rebellion. In 7 Vols. Oxford Edition.
17. Clarke, J.S. Life of James II. 2 Vols. London. 1818. Based on the original Stuart MSS.
18. Collier, Jeremy. Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain. New edition by Thomas Lathbury. 9 Vols. 1852.
19. Cotton. Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae.
20. Cox, Sir Richard. Hibernia Anglicana. History of Ireland. MDCLXXXIX.
21. Cromwell, Oliver. Letters and Speeches. Edited Thomas Carlyle. 3 Vols. Ashburton Edition.
22. /

22. Heylyn, Peter. *Aerius Redivivus* or History of the Presbyterians. 1670. 2nd Ed. 1672.
23. Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports.
24. Hoornbeek, Johannis. *Jacobi Usserii Armachani, De Reductione Episcopatus, ad formam regiminis Synodici, in antiqua Ecclesia recepti. Cum Notis.* 1661. (Utrecht).
25. Howie, John. *Scots Worthies.* Revised W.H. Carslaw. 1870.
26. *Irish Statutes.*
27. *Journals of the Irish House of Commons.*
28. King, William. *State of the Protestants of Ireland.* 1692.
29. Leland, Thomas. *History of Ireland.* 3 Vols. MDCCLXXIII.
30. *Lords' Journals.* Ireland.
31. Mant, Richard. *History of the Church of Ireland.* 2nd Ed. Vol. I. MDCCCXLI.
32. Mason, H.J. Monck. *Life of William Bedell, D.D.* MDCCCXLIII.
33. Moran, F.P. *Spicilegium Ossoriense.* Collection of Original Letters and Papers. 1874.
34. Neal, Daniel. *History of the Puritans.* 5 Vols. Foulmin's Edition. 1822.
35. Parr, Richard. *Life of James Usher.* MDCLXXXVI.
36. *Rawdon Papers.* E. Berwick. 1819.
37. *Reliquiae Baxterianae.* Baxter's Narrative of the most memorable passages of his Life and Times. Matthew Sylvester. MDCXCVI.
38. Reresby, Sir John. *Memoirs.* 1634-1689. Ed. J.J. Cartwright. 1875.
39. Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections.* 1618-1648. 8 Vols. London. 1682-1701.
40. Stewart, Andrew. *History of the Church of Ireland.* Printed with Adair's True Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Introduction and Notes by W.D. Killen. 1866.
41. Strafford, Earl of. *Letters and Dispatches.* William Knowler. 2 Vols. MDCCXL.
42. Taylor, Jeremy. *Whole Works of.* 15 Vols. Life of Reginald Heber in Vol. I.
43. Taylor, Jeremy. *Liberty of Propheying.* Introductory Essay by R. Cattermole. MDCCCXXIV.
44. Thurloe, John. *State Papers.* 7 Vols. MDCCXLI.
45. Ussher. *Works of, in 17 Vols.* Life in Vol. I. by C.R. Elrington. MDCCCXLVII. Particularly Vols. VII, XII, XV and XVI.
46. Ware, Sir James. *Works.* Vol. I. (The Bishops). Edited Walter Harris. MDCCCLXIV.
47. Whitelock, Bulstrode. *Memorials.* MDCCXXXII.

(b) More Modern Works.

1. Bagwell, Richard. Ireland under the Stuarts and during the Interregnum. 3 Vols. 1909.
2. Ball, J.T. The Reformed Church of Ireland. 1537-1889. 1890.
3. Biography, Dictionary of National. Various Articles.
4. Bonney, H.K. Life of Jeremy Taylor. 1815.
5. Cleland, William. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. 1890.
6. Cooper, James. Confessions of Faith and Formulas of Subscription. 1907.
7. Cowan, Henry. The Influence of the Scottish Church in Christendom. Baird Lecture for 1895.
8. Curtis, E. A History of Ireland. 1936.
9. Dunlop, R. A History of Ireland. 1922.
10. Firth, C.H. The Last Years of the Protectorate. 1656-1658. 2 Vols. 1909.
11. Gosse, Edmund. Jeremy Taylor. 1903.
12. Hamilton, Thomas. History of the Irish Presbyterian Church. 1887.
13. Hayden, M. and Moonan, G.A. Short History of the Irish People. 1922.
14. Hook, W.F. Ecclesiastical Biography. 1845-1852.
15. Hunt, John. Religious Thought in England. Vol. I. 1870. (For Jeremy Taylor).
16. Hutton, W.H. William Laud. 1896.
17. Irwin, C.H. A History of Presbyterianism in Dublin and the South and West of Ireland. MDCCCXC.
18. Killen, W.D. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. 2 Vols. 1875.
19. Latimer, W.T. A History of the Irish Presbyterians. 2nd Ed. 1902.
20. Lawless, E. Ireland. 1912.
21. Macaulay, Lord. History of England. 2 Vols. 1873.
22. Mahaffy, J.P. An Epoch in Irish History. Trinity College, Dublin. Its Foundation and Early Fortunes, 1591-1660. 1903.
23. Marsden, J.B. History of the Early Puritans to 1642. 1850.
24. Marsden, J.B. History of the Later Puritans. 1642-1662. 1852.
25. Morris, W.O. Ireland. 1494-1905. 1898.
26. Murray, Richard. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. 1848.
27. Ollard, S.L. and Crosse, Gordon. A Dictionary of English Church History. 1912.
28. Phillips, W.A. (Editor). History of the Church of Ireland. 3 Vols. 1933.
29. /

29. Reid, J.S. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. 3 Vols. New Ed. With additional notes by W.D. Killen. 1867.
30. Seymour, St. John D. The Puritans in Ireland. 1647-1661. 1921.
31. Shuckburgh, E.S. Two Biographies of William Bedell. 1902.
32. Simpson, W.J.S. Archbishop Bramhall. 1927.
33. Smith, H.F. Russell. The Theory of Religious Liberty in the reigns of Charles II. and James II. 1911.
34. Traill, H.D. Lord Strafford. 1889.
35. Willmott, R.A. Bishop Jeremy Taylor. MDCCCXLVII.
36. Witherow, Thomas. Historical and Literary Memorials of Presbyterianism in Ireland. 1623-1731. 1879.
37. Worley, George. Jeremy Taylor. 1904.
(Excellent Bibliographies).
38. Wright, W. Ball. A Great Yorkshire Divine of the Seventeenth Century. 1899. (Bramhall).

PART I.

SCOTLAND.

I.

A QUESTION of ORIGINS - MODERATE EPISCOPACY.

The struggle of Episcopacy and Presbytery in Scotland, England and Ireland alike was one of the outstanding features of seventeenth century history. No doubt the protagonists fought for a clear-cut and decisive victory which is not surprising in days when compromise was no virtue. All the same, in these three lands there were never wanting those who believed in the possibility of a *via media* - a way which took the form of varied degrees of accommodation or of comprehension. The object of this thesis it is, accordingly, to trace these movements, their origins, genesis and development, giving an account of the suitability of the soil in which they were rooted, discussing the chances of success and finally accounting for the eventual failure. Practically all our standard histories only refer to them incidentally, there being no book, to my knowledge, wholly devoted to the subject. Justice, accordingly, has never been done to the originators and their ideals. We shall begin with Scotland, pass over to England and conclude with Ireland, finding, as we do so, that the movements were closely inter-related.

Presbytery won the day in Scotland but does that mean that Episcopacy was entirely unsuitable and uncongenial in that land? Hardly so. No doubt Daniel Defoe was dogmatic -

"Putting all these accounts together with as much impartiality as possible it was manifest, and, I think out of dispute, that the Church of Scotland was in its origin Presbyterian but the reason I have been so long on this point, is to clear up the question that has been the occasion of so much debate in the world, whether the First Reformation of Scotland was Episcopal or Presbyterian."

On the other hand, Henry Guthry, Bishop of Dunkeld, in his "Memoirs" had another version. -

"Mr. Knox, and the rest of the ministers, together with the lords of the congregation founded the government of the church in a moderate imparity after this model was the church governed in the infancy of it, with a well-balanced harmony among churchmen, and a general liking from the people, notwithstanding of very² great troubles which at that time fell out in the state."

A further view, that it was neither the one nor the other - as a chess board is neither black nor white³ - is referred to by Defoe -

"The ambition and emulation of the clergy and nobility ushered in a model of Episcopal government, which, as it was at first a motley scheme of Church government, composed neither of Presbytery nor Prelacy, so it laid the foundation of its own corruptions, and in them of all the confusions which followed in the church."⁴

These views, mutually exclusive, are adequate proof of the complexity of the post-Reformation development of Scottish church government. Assuredly an undiluted Presbyterianism from the beginning is out of the question.

The early superintendents - five in number, the most notable being John Spottiswood of Lothian, John Willock of Glasgow and Erskine of Dun of Angus and Mearns - were hardly 'bishops done into Latin'. Doubtless they had dioceses entrusted to their care, presided in synods, visited and planted churches, gave "collation" and affixed censures - ministers, readers, elders and deacons alike being amenable to their jurisdiction. They lacked, however, the episcopal essential of consecration. Indeed, a layman might hold the office - Erskine of Dun, for example.

Says Kirkton -

"Though /

"Though these last are alleadged by some to have been bishops certain it is they hade neither the name nor the charge, nor yet any ordination save that of ordinary ministers; and for their power they were so far from dominion, that they were subjected to the command and censure of the meanest minister in all the church." ⁵

Moreover, the office was temporary. James Gordon, the parson of Rothiemay, quotes Samuel Rutherford to that effect -

"For Samuel Rutherford tells us in that booke, that superintendencie was but an office pro tempore for removall of reformatione, and only needfull for the churche (to use his own language) 'till the breestes and haire of the churche were growne' Belycke, Rutherford macks superintendents analogicall to nurses or to thes timber supporters and frames and scaffolds which masones use, by the help wherof they joyne arches, and raise upp walls to height, and afterward pull downe thes frames and scaffolds as uselesse." ⁶

In the First Book of Discipline (1560) the superintendent is named together with the minister, the elder and the deacon as composing the four orders of office-bearers in the new church. The ten superintendents, however, who presided over the ten dioceses into which the whole country was divided had their labours enumerated for them in rather striking detail, the restrictions being very obvious. The language of the document also seems to imply that no idea of perpetuity was attached to the office - a fact in keeping with Samuel Rutherford's views. The Episcopacy of the First Book of Discipline, accordingly, is attenuated.

The real struggle between Episcopacy and Presbytery began in 1571 when the Parliament met at Stirling and appointed a new leet of nominal bishops to the vacant sees. It must be remembered that Episcopacy, in so far as the temporal privileges of the bishops were concerned, was still maintained despite the fact that their spiritual power was abolished. Indeed, it had been stated "the

reason assigned for its (Episcopacy) introduction was not the preservation of three orders in the ministry, but the preservation of three orders in parliament. It was founded on political expediency and not on Divine authority." ⁷ "There was little religious in the early features of Reformation Episcopacy", it has been said in another place. "Episcopacy was first revived to save for the church the relics of her property, then to superintend a Presbyterian organisation, and only later for the conveying of Holy Orders." ⁸ In 1571 when the Parliament met the old Spiritual Estate continued to exist as one of the Estates of the realm. It still retained its property, its voice in Parliament never having been denied. The monastic prelates, titulars of abbeys, priors and abbots were continued in the enjoyment of their revenues, held their seats in Parliament and in the College of Justice, but, inasmuch as they had no function in the church, were really temporal lords. The bishops and abbots, however, were steadily becoming fewer by death and feuars and heritable tenants could not get entry to their lands, there being none to give it. To rectify this the Parliament of August 1571 enacted that all such ecclesiastical feuars and tenants should henceforth hold their feus and possessions direct from the King - a transaction tantamount to confiscation of a large part of church property.

With this act begins the real struggle of Episcopacy and Presbytery. At the time the King's party was in dire need of money. Morton, accordingly, hit on a scheme which at once satisfied his /

his own greed and gave a semblance of public policy viz:- to appropriate the immense wealth of the ancient Church. Furthermore - and here his public policy came in - in pursuance of his project of the union of the crowns of England and Scotland he regarded it as imperative that the churches of the two countries should be one in polity and doctrine. Hence the Convention of Leith in 1572. The decisive result was that the titles Archbishop, bishop, abbot and prior were to be preserved, though the accompanying powers and privileges fell far short of those in the ancient Church. All the titles, be it noted, had been abolished by the First Book of Discipline. Thus came into being the famous tulchan bishops. That the creation was by no means popular is admitted even by Bishop Guthry. "Some of the ministry were displeased" he says, "and made a kind of protestation against the same."⁹ Admittedly, the tulchan bishopric was a political office and not a pastoral. The Episcopacy, if such it was, was the merest shadow of that in England - that a sole power of ordination and jurisdiction over a whole diocese should be in one man's hand was never dreamt of. Defoe, besides pointing out that this Episcopacy came in fettered and shackled with limitation of power and 'castration of stipends', puts his finger on the real reason why the nobility were so zealous for the 'new model.' The gentlemen, he says, retained to themselves the revenues of the church, either in temporalities feued to themselves, as they call it in Scotland, or pensions and payments which they obtained from the churchmen, which they could never before obtain under the ministers.¹⁰

It /

It is significant of the state of Episcopacy in Scotland that at the General Assembly of March 1573, while the Archbishop of St. Andrews was present, it was a parochial minister who presided as moderator. The bishops had their duties pointed out to them, were commanded to present themselves at all the diets of every Assembly and to give heed to the instructions which pastors and elders might in their collective capacities give them. The superintendents and commissioners of the Church alone had the power of deposing ministers and were not to be interfered with by the bishops. These latter could not even officiate in the districts entrusted to the superintendents without special permission. The bishops, indeed, were little better than superintendents." In fact in 1574 the General Assembly declared them to be only pastors in one parish, several of them, indeed, being delated for not preaching or for not attending at their charge. Bishop Guthry ("Memoirs" p. 7) chronicles that by 1575 the King had carried his design without difficulty and episcopal government was established by law. Yet in that very year in the presence of the Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishops of Dunkeld, Galloway, Brechin, Dunblane and the Isles who listened in silence, the Assembly resolved that the name of bishop was common to one that had a particular flock. Out of the number of bishops some might be chosen to have power to oversee and visit such reasonable bounds, besides his own flock, as the General Assembly might appoint; and in these bounds to appoint ministers, with the consent of the ministers of that province, and with the consent of /

of the flock (mark that, says Defoe) to whom they should be appointed; as also to appoint elders and deacons in every particular congregation where there was none, with consent of the people thereof (mark that also, adds Defoe), and to suspend ministers for reasonable causes, with consent of the ministers aforesaid.

Up to 1575 it had been the church of Knox, now it was the church of Melville. Again, in 1576 the General Assembly ordained the bishops to make choice of one parish and in the following year ordained them to be called by their own names or brethren only. A stop was put to their number and it was ordered that no bishop be elected or admitted before the next General Assembly, that ministers and chapters should not in any way proceed to the election of any bishop on pain of deprivation. In 1578 the said law was made perpetual and all bishops already elected were required to submit themselves to the General Assembly. "Thus", declares Defoe, "that infant mongrel Episcopacy, so it was then called, was voted out of the church as a nuisance." ¹² In 1580 the culmination of the process was reached by the declaration that Episcopacy was of human invention - no longer merely inexpedient but unlawful and contrary to scripture.

Epitomising the period up to 1580 we may say the minutes of all the Assemblies give clear proof that bishops were subject to their discipline by admonition, public repentance, suspension and deprivation, that they were not to give collation to any benefice and that 'bishop' was a term of application to all who had a particular /

particular flock. In 1581 met the memorable General Assembly which, in accordance with a letter from the King, established those courts known as Presbyteries so characteristic of Scottish Protestantism. The Assembly was equally notable for its sanction of the Second Book of Discipline, a treatise which directly declared pastor, minister, bishop to be but different names for the same office.

In the evolution of Scottish ecclesiastical history the year 1584 is a notable one. In it were passed the famous "Black Acts" wherein it was declared that the King was head not only of the State but of the Church as well, that no Assemblies of the Church should be held without his sanction, that bishops should be appointed and that he should have the appointment of them and finally, that no minister should express his opinion on public affairs under pain of treason. Despite the severity of these Acts, however, the modified nature of the episcopacy is still apparent. In May of the next year the Assembly met and a conference was managed by commissioners on both sides with the result that an accommodation was brought about. "The King insisted upon the name of Bishop, the Assembly upon the power and office. The Assembly granted the name, and the King gave up the power; and thus the matter seemed to be compromised between them." Furthermore, the bishop was still "pastor of a congregation" and "subject to the Assembly." In 1587 Parliament passed an act that all ecclesiastical property should henceforth belong to the King - provision being made for the sustenance and housing of the /

the clergy in all their degrees. Thus it was clearly shown that English Episcopacy was impossible in Scotland besides amply demonstrating that James's bishops existed merely for reasons of state.

The year 1592 was a year of reaction as far as James's Church policy was concerned. Various reasons have been assigned for this - the volatile humour of the King, the horror arising from the murder of the Earl of Moray, the threatening of the pulpit - but whatever they were, Parliament passed in June the Act popularly known as the "Magna Charta of Presbytery", ratifying the liberty of the Church, giving a legal jurisdiction to its courts, declaring that the Acts of 1584 were abrogated, in so far as they impinged on ecclesiastical authority in matters of religion, heresy, excommunication, or collation, and providing that presentations should henceforward be directed, not to the bishops, but to the presbyteries within whose bounds the vacant benefices lay. In the following years reaction again set in and James once more dominated the situation and in successive General Assemblies apparently undermined the Presbyterian system. In March 1598 the Assembly at Dundee concluded that it was necessary and expedient for the weal of the Church that the ministry, as the third estate, should vote in Parliament in the name of the Church, and that the number admitted be fifty-one, as it had been of old, in place of the bishops, abbots and priors. But the ministers were not blind to the trend of the events - as Davidson put it, the horns of the mitre were already apparent and James's pretensions more and more evident.

It is always a difficult task for the historian to characterize the position of the King in things ecclesiastical, he being in this particular field evasive and vacillating. Kirkton declares him to have been learned, reserved, without vices (except swearing) and modest in religion.¹⁴ It is certain he was as much more clever than his son Charles as he was less sincerely religious - if, indeed, his religion had any reality at all about it and was not, as Dr. Aiton says, a mere pretence.¹⁵ At first he was an ardent supporter of the Calvinists. So soon, however, as he saw that the Arminians were supporters of his theory of divine hereditary right and absolute prerogative he promptly transferred his affections to that party. (According to Secretan, James's Episcopacy in Scotland was 'a regular Protestant' Episcopacy.¹⁶) Burnet asserts that he was brought up in a most inveterate hatred of presbytery¹⁷ yet he delighted the hearts of the ministers at the Edinburgh General Assembly of August 4, 1590 by his polemic against Anglican Episcopacy. Their service, he declared, was an evil mass said in English.¹⁸ Furthermore, to complicate any estimate, we have the assertion of Burnet that in order to facilitate his accession to the English throne James sought to conciliate the Roman Catholics and that from the year 1606 'to his dying day he continued always writing and talking against popery, but acting for it.'¹⁹ When Burnet refers to the King's 'intention to carry on a conformity in matters of religion with England'²⁰ he touches one of the items in his religious policy in which he was undoubtedly consistent, the other being his determination to curb the /

the freedom of the pulpit. In short, absolutism pure and undiluted in matters ecclesiastical was the ultimate aim. (In a letter dated 10th July 1618 James is at no pains to hide his intentions. See Miscellany of the Maitland Club, Vol. IV. Part 1. 1847. p. 141.) "He spent his thoughts", says Kirkton, "upon such designs as might rather make him absolute at home than powerful abroad."²¹ What this meant for the church we may see when we remember - as has been pointed out by a distinguished historian that in Scotland in the seventeenth century the royal absolutism was shown almost entirely in affairs of the church and there was no clear issue without appeals to religion between despotism and liberty.²² If James was to be successful not only had the independent popular discussion of the Assembly to be a thing of the past but the severity of pulpit censure had to be irrevocably curbed. "To have matters ruled as they have been in your General Assemblies", declared the King, "I will never agree, for the bishops must rule the ministers and the King rule both, in matters indifferent and not repugnant to the word of God."²³ Along with this resolution we have the cognate one that he would only employ such ministers of state as he could hang and we see James's despotism complete.²⁴ The truth of the matter is that his desire of Episcopacy was not prompted by any belief in the divine right of that order but merely the knowledge that by the agency of bishops of his own choosing he would attain in no small degree to that fuller prerogative which was his constant goal. James, however, be it said - and here he compared favourably with his son, /

son, always put a semblance of lawfulness on his actions and carried the church with him. "King James, of blessed memory", says Bishop Guthrie, "had never pressed any thing that way (i.e. without the consent of the church) but whatsoever he would have done, used to take a church way in it." ²⁵ From 1596 he was definitely anti-Presbyterian and never rested till he had got all ecclesiastical power into his own hands. In 1600 a General Assembly that met at Montrose sanctioned an arrangement whereby certain ministers known as Commissioners were to have a seat and a vote in Parliament. It is interesting to note, however, that even yet the Assembly provided the safeguard that ministers so appointed should continue to have charge of parishes and hold their seats in Parliament only for a year. The year 1606 brought a real change. A General Assembly at Linlithgow appointed the bishops as perpetual moderators of their respective presbyteries and diocesan synods. Constant moderators were practically tantamount to diocesan Episcopacy and so James was well on the road to victory. It was only relative, however, as these episcopal moderators were subjected to the censure of the Assemblies over which they presided and as yet it can still be maintained there was nothing more than an establishment of civil jurisdiction given to the bishops. The Edinburgh Parliament of 24th June 1609 passed an Act in their favour restoring to them the old jurisdiction of commissariats, touching wills and marriages, and of spiritual and ecclesiastical causes, the Court of Session being authorized to enforce the execution of their sentences. In June 1610 the famous
but /

but packed and muzzled Assembly of Glasgow was held. General Assemblies, it was concluded, were to be summoned at the King's pleasure and the machinery of the church was so adjusted that the bishops should have full diocesan powers. The bishops, moreover, were the nominees of the King. James's triumph was complete. Parliament in October 1612 ratified the Acts of the Glasgow Assembly in favour of Episcopacy and the King had succeeded in moulding the polity of the church into a shape in keeping with his ideas of royal prerogative. No doubt he flattered himself that he had cajoled the church into accepting diocesan Episcopacy but he was assuredly mistaken for the First Episcopacy into which Robert Leighton was born was of that modified and unique character in connection with which the future Archbishop was destined to spend much of his life. The Leith Convention had agreed to the grand declaration and the church had accepted it two years later - that the General Assembly was superior to bishops, capable of trying and deposing them. This declaration, strangely enough, had never been revoked and Presbyterianism - dangerously near the precipice - still existed. The First Episcopacy may have been admirably suited for James's purposes but it would be more accurately described as an Episcopal covering superimposed on a Presbyterian structure. The Kirk Session was still the body where any process of excommunication had to arise, presbyteries had still to meet for the exercise of doctrine, bishops had to associate the ministers of the bounds with them in the preliminaries and also in the act of ordination and in the deposition /

deposition of ministers. They had to hold diocesan synods twice a year at least - and finally, be it noted, were themselves subject to the censures of the General Assembly. Indeed, this early period in which Leighton first saw the light is singularly similar to that at the Restoration in which he played so distinguished a part. An opportunity for the reconciliation of Episcopalian and Presbyterian presented itself but in both cases it was unfortunately allowed to pass. With time and tact and patience it is just possible that the Presbyterians might have acquiesced in some modified system of Episcopacy.

I. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Memoirs of the Church of Scotland in four periods.
MDCCLXLIV. Part II p. 75.
2. Memoirs of Henry Guthry, Bishop of Dunkeld. pp. 1-2.
3. Puritanism in the Scottish Church. Hastie Lectures.
W.S. Provand, M.A., p. 45.
4. Defoe's Memoirs. Part II p. 64.
5. Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland from
the Restoration to the year 1678. Edited Sharpe,
1817. p. 13.
6. History of Scots Affairs. From MDCXXXVII to MDCXLI.
Vol. II p. 109.
7. Life and Times of Alexander Henderson, 1836. pp. 6-7.
8. Do. p. 3.
9. Memoirs. p. 3.
10. Memoirs. Part II pp. 65-66.
11. Defoe's Memoirs. Part II p. 67.
12. Memoirs. Part II p. 72.
13. Memoirs. Part II p. 93.
14. Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland. p. 20.
15. Life and Times of Alexander Henderson. John Aiton, D.D.
p. 49.
16. The Troubled Times and Holy Life of Archbishop Leighton.
Rev. C.F. Secretan, M.A. p. 4.
17. Burnet's History of his own Time. Oxford Edition, 1833.
p. 13.
18. Defoe's Memoirs. Part II pp. 96-97.
19. Burnet's History of his own Time. Oxford Edition, 1833.
Vol. I pp. 13, 21.
20. Burnet's History of his own Time. Oxford Edition, 1833.
Vol. I p. 17.
21. Kirkton. p. 299.
22. Prof. Herkless. Article "Covenanters" in Hastings'
"Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics". Vol. IV
p. 216.
23. A Short History of the Church of Scotland.
Rev. Anthony Mitchell, B.D., 1907. p. 74.
24. Scottish Historical Review. Vol. X, 1913. pp. 316-317.
25. Memoirs. Henry Guthry, Bishop of Dunkeld. pp. 21-22.

II.

THE POLICY of CHARLES I.

Up to 1612 James's chief aim had been the establishment of diocesan Episcopacy and we have seen the success that attended his efforts. After that date his objective was the acceptance by the Scottish Church of certain rites and doctrines. It is not, however, our business to give a detailed account of this struggle except in so far as it had a relationship to accommodation movements. Steps in the evolution were the Aberdeen Assembly of August the 13th, 1616, with its enhanced powers for bishops, the proposal of the King in June 1617 to the Lords of the Articles that "whatsoever his Majesty should determine touching the external government of the Church, with the advice of the archbishops, bishops and a competent number of the clergy, should have the strength of a law" and the five Articles of the General Assembly of August 1618.

The King had won the day but his victory was only superficial. He could get the Privy Council to pass an Act confirming the procedure of the Assembly and enjoin compliance upon both ministers and people but he could not effectively put the law into execution. Ministers refused to read the Articles from the pulpit or to dispense the sacrament to kneeling communicants. The town churches were deserted and the people flocked to conventicles where they could have ministrations in the old way. The imposition of James's innovations may have been outwardly successful but in reality /

reality they were calling forth latent forces that were in the future to ruin the Stuart House. To the end of his reign the enforcement of kneeling at Communion and observance of the great festivals were far from complete. Spottiswoode's verdict is given in a letter of May 1623. "And for our Church matters", he says, "they are gone unless another course be taken." The King's efforts to subvert Presbyterianism were successful but in as far as his new model was admitted - however grudgingly - it was of that distinctive and unique character to which reference has already been made. This it is important to observe, it being a paramount factor in the possibility of any accommodation.

James died on 27th May, 1625 and with the accession of Charles I came a new period in Scottish ecclesiastical history. It is important, I think, to have some contemporary idea of his character, he being so closely connected with the comprehension schemes of his reign and on him depending so much of the ultimate success or failure. Burnet is particularly severe in his character sketch. He declares himself incapable of admiring either his judgment, understanding or temper. "He had little regard to law", he says, "and seemed to think he was not bound to observe promises or concessions that were extorted from him by the necessity of his affairs. He had little tenderness in his nature; and probably his government would have been severe if he had got the better of the war; his ministers had a hard time under him. He loved violent counsels, but conducted them so ill, that they saw they must all perish with him." ² He also speaks of his "grave /

"grave reserved deportment" and compares the affability of his father,³ yet he had a certain suavity and polish of manner that made him attractive to those who came in contact with him. Even the covenanter Robert Baillie calls him "a good prince"⁴ though he bewails his "unhappie wilfulness"⁵ and the fact that he was a "Canterburian".⁶ Wishart in his Memoirs of Montrose says Charles II had tenfold his father's faults and none of his virtues.⁷ The elder Charles was possessed, it is said, of a mind singularly retentive of impressions once made upon it but he had no mental growth, no geniality of temperament, leading him to modify his own opinions through intercourse with his fellow men, neither did he know, as Elizabeth had known, how to withdraw from an untenable position. After the assassination of Buckingham, moreover, he never gave his complete confidence to any one.⁸ The absolutist policy of his father received a further impetus at his hands though he was incapable of moving with the cleverness, caution and cunning that his father always displayed. Both alike were ready and willing adherents to the Tudor maxim that the executive government of the crown was not subject to the control of Parliament. Both, too, believed strenuously in the divine right of Kings. Assuredly this did not augur too well for negotiation or the finding of a *via media*.

The divine right of kings was a factor he cannot omit in the present study. "It is atheism and blasphemy", said James, "to dispute what God can do; good Christians content themselves with His /

His will revealed in His Word, so it is presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a King can do; or say that a King cannot do this or that, but rest in that which is the King's will revealed in his law." ⁹ "Monarchy", he wrote in his "The True Law of Free Monarchies" published in 1598, "as resembling the Divinity, approacheth nearest to perfection, as all the learned and wise men from the beginning have agreed upon." "Kings are called Gods by the prophetic King David, because they sit upon God his throne upon earth, and have the count of their ministration to give unto him." In the "Basilikon Doron" James bids his son know and love God, who had made him "a little God to sit on his throne, and rule over other men." Giving every allowance for the fact that in the seventeenth century Scotsmen revered monarchy in a remarkable degree because of its authoritative sanction in scripture it is yet remarkable how James's excessive claims obtained such a hold in the country. Typical of the time is the entry in the Book of Record kept by Patrick, First Earl of Strathmore, when he conjures his posterity "never to engage themselves upon any pretence whatsoever against the interest of their lawfull King." ¹⁰ That Leighton had an interest in the claims of James and Charles and in the theory of divine right - and rejects to some extent the dominant thought of the time - is attested not only by his own works but by his library as well. ¹¹

Charles adhered to episcopacy as the form of church government he wished to see fully established in Scotland quite as strongly /

strongly as his father, though to the latter's merely utilitarian motives he added sincere conviction. "Nothing so combines with government", wrote Jeremy Taylor, "if it be of God's appointment, as the religion of the Church of England"¹² and Charles thoroughly agreed. "No bishop, no King" was as much one of his maxims as his father's. "Presbytery, who euer were and wilbee enemies to Monarchy"¹³ wrote an unknown correspondent to the Earl of Lanrick in 1648, repeating a common Royalist slander of the day. The Marquis of Hamilton, writing to the King in 1638, declared of the Glasgow Assembly then sitting "I know weill it is chieflie monarchie which is intended by them to be destroyed."¹⁴ Insinuations of this kind did their work. Not only did Charles refuse to rescind the Acts of Parliament in favour of Episcopacy, which Acts "our father with so much expense of time and industrie established, and which may hereafter be of great use to us"¹⁵ but he gave his royal sanction to the accusation against the Presbyterians by his declaration that there were few against Episcopal government who were not against Monarchy in their hearts.¹⁶ This Stuart tradition was carried on by Charles II when he wrote of Presbytery regarding "the unsuitableness thereof to our monarchical state."¹⁷ Nor was such a belief confined to the court for it was undoubtedly held by a popular stratum in the country. In the sixteenth century Lord Maitland of Thirlestane and Lord Menmuir had seen the political advantages of Episcopacy. At a somewhat later period the diarist Nicoll recorded of the clergy that they were "mony of thame aganes monarchy."¹⁸ While a minister very typical /

typical of the North of Scotland Church could write after the dissolving of the General Assembly by Colonel Cotterel in 1653 - "Episcopacy had the honour to proceed, nor could Monarchy be abolished while it stood, and Presbytery had the disgrace of following royall ruins; so, to our griefe, after King, exit Kirk."¹⁹ At a still later period Archbishop Sharp, while at one time declaring Presbytery to be as consistent with the King's interest as Episcopacy,²⁰ at another is equally emphatic that when Episcopacy was wanting there was nothing but troubles and disturbances both in church and state,²¹ while after the Pentland Rising he informs Archbishop Sheldon that there were none disaffected to episcopacy who were not known or justly suspected to be rooted in their enmity to the rights and prerogative of the Crown.²² Needless to say, when Presbyterianism was so suspected Independency met no better fate.²³ While rebutting the charge made against them the reasons assigned by the strict Presbyterians for the Stuart love of episcopacy were of a very different nature. Kirkton says that the real reasons were that the bishops were supporters of the doctrine of non-resistance, that their votes could always be relied on, that they would heighten the royal prerogative and - in keeping with the demand of the time - would exercise a lax discipline.²⁴ Wodrow repeats all these statements and gives the additional reasons that the bishops believed the King could do no wrong, that they "were for the King's absolute illimitable power, and some for his universal property", and that they were ready tools for arbitrary government.²⁵

It would manifestly be unfair, however, and untrue in the case of Charles I at least, to give such utilitarian reasons for his belief in episcopacy. In the seventeenth century the question of the divine right of various forms of church government was an urgent and living one.²⁶ Men like Adrian Saravia, Bishops Bilson, Bancroft and Andrewes, Hall and Thorndike contended for a iure divino Episcopacy. In Scotland Erskine of Dun had approximated to this position, and when it suited him it was roundly asserted by Archbishop Sharp,²⁷ who claimed that it was held not only by Charles I but by his father and son as well.²⁵ Of Charles I there can be no reasonable doubt.²⁹ Yet it must be doubted whether this mode of thought was congenial to Scotsmen. No clear case was ever made in Scotland for an episcopacy of divine origin. Leighton himself, in referring to the Presbyterian claim for divine right, declared "the assertors" of other forms "do not usually speak so big."³⁰ It is just here, perhaps, that we touch one of the main reasons why in Scotland Episcopacy did not survive the Stuarts. In England it rested on a theological basis - a fact which we shall examine more minutely when we come to the part of the thesis dealing with England - but in Scotland the claim for divine right never came to the surface. In the popular estimation Episcopacy was "one of the first-fruits of absolute and arbitrary power, and the mere effect of royal pleasure."³¹ Charles's ignorance of Scottish thought and character was destined to be fruitful of much trouble to himself. Presbyterians like Kirkton marked his dislike of their party and regarded with alarm his preference /

preference even for Independency.³² They were in grave fear of any growth of Roman Catholicism and suspected the King. No doubt Burnet speaks of his "firm aversion to popery" yet in the same sentence he admits he "was much inclined to a middle way between protestants and papists."³³ The descendants of Knox were for no middle way. For them Episcopacy was but the vehicle of popery³⁴ - an accusation that Leighton keenly felt and refuted.³⁵

Unfortunately for Scotland Charles's main coadjutor in religious matters was Laud. From the original sources we can see that his ignorance of things Scottish was greater even than that of Charles himself.³⁶ His ecclesiastical outlook and the school of thought to which he belonged were peculiarly abnoxious to the /s northern kingdom. He had early imbibed the teaching of his tutor John Buckeridge with his stress on sacramental grace and the episcopal organisation of the Church of England. For Laud, it is said, the external obligation always took precedence of the spiritual conception.³⁷ As an advanced adherent of the Anglo-Catholic school founded by Bishop Andrewes the doctrine of Apostolic Succession and the sacerdotal theory of the ministry were for him fundamental. Yet his latitude and breadth of theology gave him something in common with Leighton and his school. Indeed, the contrast in this respect with the bigotry and narrowness in dealing with individuals who crossed his path - Leighton's own father being an admirable example - is very marked. He strove against the position that all points defined by the church are fundamental, his constant aim being to narrow the scope of dogmatism, for, from his /

his point of view, the Church of England could not possibly preserve any unity if men were to be forced to subscribe to curious particulars disputed in schools. Here, apparently, was a hopeful feature for the advocates of accommodation.³⁸ Leighton, it will be remembered, spoke in like manner of "uncontroverted principles" of religion which were "few and clear", though his Calvinism made a great gulf between him and Laud. His official severity and his implicit belief in the efficacy of reward and punishment have often been commented upon. Baillie frequently makes mention of it.³⁹ Burnet, while admitting he was learned, sincere, zealous, regular in his own life and humble in his private deportment, says he was a hot, indiscreet man, eagerly pursuing some matters that were either very inconsiderable or mischievous. His high-handed dealings, he adds, "were such visible blemishes, that nothing but the putting him to death in so unjust a manner could have raised his character."⁴⁰ Yet, it should not be forgotten that beneath this covering of severity there occasionally shone forth a vein of kindness. Baillie whom we have just seen as adverse critic could also write "Canterburie is become our great friend."⁴¹ From the Scottish standpoint, however, the chief interest of Laud was not merely his dislike of Presbyterianism but his resolution to conform the Scottish Church to the English model. This was part of a still wider policy inasmuch as Strafford, Bramhall and Laud conjoined in a scheme to break down every mark of singularity in the Irish Church and bring it into conformity with that of England.⁴² A patriarchate /

patriarchate of the three kingdoms under the jurisdiction of Canterbury, was the ultimate aim. As in their eyes, however, Laud was the very embodiment of Arminian and Romanizing proclivities the Scots were greatly alarmed. No doubt it is easy now to be wise after the event and say that they were mistaken but at the time Rome was making a deliberate attempt to extend her influence in England and so, naturally enough, they looked on the new movement with suspicion and dislike. Laud did regard the Church of Rome as a true church because "it received the scriptures as a rule of faith, though but as a partial and imperfect rule and both the sacraments as instrumental causes and seals of grace", but to the day of his death he denied any advancing of Roman interests.

Into the ensuing struggle over the new Service Book and the "Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical for the Government of the Church of Scotland" it is not necessary to enter, it not being indispensable for our subject. Suffice it to say that the high-handed mode of introduction boded no good.

Says Gordon -

"The informality of its introduction was notorious and for the straine thereof manye who understoode bothe deemd that it resembled a Boniface, or a Gregory, or a Clement sitting in the Vaticane of Rome, compyling ther Decretalls, or Clementines or Extravagants. For many sober ministers, who otherwayes favoured the bishopps, wer startled with thes Cannons, and thought them grossly extravagantt as bewraying a too great neglect of all the churche in the introductione of them, and a too great usurpatione of power to themselves in thes Canons there sett downe." ^{43.}

The liturgy is somewhat erroneously known as "Laud's Liturgy."

It /

It was not really his work but that of two Scottish bishops, Maxwell of Ross and Wedderburn of Dunblane. There is some evidence that Laud did not originally want it⁴⁴ and his contribution seems to have been confined to preliminary suggestion and subsequent revision. Accordingly, it is only fair to say the work is characteristically Scottish, though the Archbishop of Canterbury's contribution was of fatal importance. According to Gordon Charles ordered the bishops to proceed with moderation⁴⁵ yet his consummate folly is seen in the actual manner of introduction - a manner intimately described by Guthry⁴⁶ and Baillie,⁴⁷ Gordon⁴⁸ and Burnet.⁴⁹

But into the riot of St. Giles on Sunday, 23rd July, 1637 it is not necessary for us to enter as it does not affect our immediate subject. Scottish popular opinion found vent in innumerable petitions and supplications - a custom beloved of the Scots - and issued eventually in the National Covenant of 1638 - which, however, as being relevant to our subject, we reserve for the next chapter.

II. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Original Letters. p. 713.
2. Burnet. Vol. I pp. 544-545.
3. Burnet. Vol. I p. 34.
4. Baillie. Letters and Journals. Vol. II p. 372.
5. Do. Vol. III pp. 4 & 9.
6. Do. Vol. III p. 4.
7. Memoirs of James, Marquis of Montrose, 1639-1650,
by the Rev. George Wishart, D.D. Translated etc.
by Rev. A.D. Murdoch and H.F.M. Simpson, 1893.
p. 290.
8. Dictionary of National Biography. Vol. X pp. 68, 74, 77.
(S.R. Gardiner).
9. The English Church in the Seventeenth Century.
C.S. Carter, M.A. p. 20.
10. Book of Record. A diary written by Patrick, First Earl
of Strathmore, and other documents relating to Glamis
Castle. 1684-1689. Edited by A.H. Miller.
Scot. Hist. Socy., 1890. p. 21.
11. See Leighton's Works. Vol. VII pp. 163 & 275: Vol. III
p. 290: For reference to Leighton's Library see
Transactions of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society.
Vol. I. 1886-9. Part IV. p. 55.
12. "Jeremy Taylor" by H. Hensley Henson in "Typical English
Churchmen". Edited by W.E. Collins. Church
Historical Society. p. 127.
13. Hamilton Papers, 1638-1648. Edited by S.R. Gardiner.
Camden Society, 1880. p. 175.
14. Do. p. 40.
15. Historical Manuscripts Commission. 9th Report, 1883-4.
Traquair MSS. p. 250, Part II.
16. Do. 11th Report. Part VI. (1887) p. 97.
17. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs of the affairs of Scotland
from the restoration of Charles II. 1821. pp. 57-8.
18. John Nicoll's Diary of public transactions and other
occurrences, chiefly in Scotland. 1650-1667.
Bannatyne Club. p. 60.
19. Chronicles of the Frasers. James Fraser, minister of
Wardlaw. Edited by W. Mackay. Scot. Hist. Socy.
Edinburgh, 1905. pp. 402-403.
20. Lauderdale Papers. Edited by Osmund Airy. Camden
Society. Vol. I. 1639-1667. p. 48.
21. Nicoll's Diary. p. 146.
22. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II pp. xxxviii/ix.
23. Hamilton Papers. p. 124.
24. Kirkton. pp. 131, 132, 179.
25. The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland
from the Restoration to the Revolution. Robert Wodrow.
Vol. I. p. 224 seq.

26. cf. Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie.
MDCXXXI - MDCLIV. Aberdeen. Spalding Club.
1843. p. 32.
27. H.M.C. 2nd Report, 1871. MSS. of Trinity College,
Glenalmond. p. 203.
28. Do.
29. For proof see his letter to the Earl of Traquair.
Oct. 10, 1639. H.M.C. 9th Report. Traquair MSS.
p. 250, Part II.
30. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII. p. 193.
31. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 232.
32. Kirkton. p. 40.
33. Burnet. Vol. I pp. 86-87.
34. Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 62.
35. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII. p. 213.
36. See e.g. H.M.C. 12th Report. Part II. 1888.
Coke MSS. p. 214.
37. D.N.B. Vol. XXXII. p. 188. (S.R. Gardiner).
38. Leighton's Works. Vol. VI. pp. 295-296.
39. Baillie. Vol. I. pp. 72, 90.
40. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 91-92.
41. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 105.
42. "John Bramhall" by W.E. Collins in "Typical English
Churchmen". Edited by W.E. Collins. Church
Historical Society. pp. 90-91.
43. Gordon. Vol. II. p. 92.
44. Works. Vol. III. p. 336. Parker, Oxford. 1849.
45. Gordon. Vol. I. p. 6.
46. Guthry's Memoirs. p. 21.
47. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 2.
48. Gordon. Vol. II. p. 80.
49. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 45.

III.

THE NATIONAL COVENANT of 1638.

It is essential to examine this famous covenant in any study of Scottish accommodation movements in the seventeenth century, a cursory perusal of the history of those times sometimes giving the impression that it effectively closed the door to even the possibility of any such movements. Was that the case? An examination of the original sources, in my opinion, shows it was not. Nor is it necessary for us to outline the genesis of the Covenant, its formation and publication. These are all sufficiently narrated in the standard histories. Suffice it to say that the Presbyterianism of the country was to be leagued together by a solemn confession and covenant. The preparation of this document was entrusted to Alexander Henderson, a man who, in "gravity, learning, wisdom, and state-policy" far exceeded the rest of the ministry, "temperate in speech, sagacious and practical"² and to Johnstone of Warriston, a man whose greatness, amply acknowledged by Baillie³ yet cannot disguise the fact that he was an "austere presbyterian zealot, full of fire, of heavy energy and gloom"⁴ - "a fanatic of the purest type."⁵ The revision of the document was put in the hands of Lords Rothes, Loudon and Balmerino. It consisted of three parts. The first was a transcript of the Confession of 1581, the second was a summary of the Acts of Parliament condemning Popery, and ratifying the liberties of the Scottish Church, and the third was the Covenant proper, in which the subscribers swore, by the great name of the Lord their God, that they would continue in the /

the profession of their religion; that they would defend it against all errors and corruptions; and that they would stand by his Majesty in support of the religion, liberties, and laws of the kingdom, and also by one another against all their enemies. Such was the National Covenant of 1638 which Professor Terry terms the "most fateful of Scottish documents",⁶ and which, as Andrew Lang points out, was destined for some fifty years to incarnadine the fields and moors and streets of Scotland.⁷

The success was unquestioned - in Edinburgh particularly. Copies sent down to presbyteries were quickly utilised. All the shires signed and all the towns except Aberdeen, St. Andrews and Crail. Of noblemen, not Papists or Privy Councillors, all but five signed. The wonderful unanimity of Covenanting feeling and enthusiasm is a matter of comment by contemporary chroniclers and historians.⁸ The covenanting success was, it seems, complete, yet it is well to note, in view of future happenings that it was not entirely so, for it embodied certain features likely to be prejudicial in the eyes of tolerant and thoughtful men. The energetic enthusiasm of the Covenanters should not blind us to the fact that the northern part of the country was thoroughly Episcopal in sympathy - a fact which chagrined even the covenanter Dickson into the declaration that the devils in the north were much worse than those of the west.⁹ That interesting covenanter, James Nimmo, whose narrative is so useful for understanding the covenanting mind, states that when he was in the north there was little of the fear of God which was his way of declaring that the covenant was /

was not popular.¹⁰ Even in Morayshire he did not deem himself on congenial soil.¹¹ Baillie not only admits that Aberdeen was estranged from his side but also expresses his fear about what side Glasgow is likely to take.¹² At the Restoration when the ecclesiastical government was changed another unmistakable proof of the episcopal leanings of the north was given, for few of the clergy stood out.¹³ Wodrow speaks of the Tay as the dividing line between the Episcopal and Presbyterian divisions of the country¹⁴ and while admitting the conformity of the north expresses his opinion - typical of his school - that "this stroke lay heaviest where people had most of the gospel and knowledge of real religion".¹⁵ The clergy of the north were often sons of lairds or of the larger tacksmen or farmers - usually men of education and intelligence. No doubt they were more Laodicean than the Lowland clergy but they assuredly surpassed them in charitableness and toleration.

Moreover, in the Lowlands themselves opposition was more than latent. The number who had conscientious difficulties does not appear to have been small.¹⁶ "Others wer non-subscribents", says Gordon, "as being unsatisfieed that the ceremonyes of the Church of Englande, Pearthe Articles and episcopacye, should be abjurd as poperye, they being already established."¹⁷ Occasional references in presbytery registers are in marked contrast to the enthusiastic pictures drawn by covenanting historians. A certain James Douglas, for example, we read in the registers of the Presbytery of Lanark, admitted "as for runawayes fra the Covenant, he did not deny /

deny bot there wer too many among us, and too great a backslyding amongst us all." ¹⁸ With such facts in consideration, accordingly, some historians have been bold enough to assert that while few had the courage to oppose the Covenant openly, there were many throughout the country who were averse to it. ¹⁹ Not a few were alienated by the manner in which the Covenant was administered. What should have been an instrument of liberty in the fight against Stuart despotism deteriorated into a tool of despotism itself. Baillie himself could be broad-minded and tolerant enough to waive the administration of the Covenant in particular cases ²⁰ yet the general body of the Presbyterians were foolish enough to make it a stumbling block. Indeed, while at first they were willing to accept subscription with limitations, restrictions, or declarations, "as they grew mor imperiouse" ²¹ they began to refuse all such - so Burnet and Spalding inform us. Such a pressure was brought to bear on public men as to make their lives a misery.

The saintly Dr. John Forbes, Professor of Divinity at King's College, Aberdeen, wrote in his diary how grieved he was to be threatened and reproached by his countrymen, subscribers of the Covenant, who boasted to take his life, his estate and his good name from him all at once. ²² Nor was this mere rhetoric. Spalding instances the Laird of Pitmedden's ground of Barrach "and sundrie other pairts of this countrey" which were plundered "whilk made them all to come in and subscribe the covenant" while a Committee (the Earl of Marischal, the Earl of Seaforth, Lord Fraser, Master of Forbes etc.) held at Turriff summoned "all such persons within /

within this diocie as had not subscribed their covenant, and ther to subscribe the samen under the pain of plundering. The like pain was never given out befor be any king of this kingdom, but now begune by subjects upon subjects but authoritie." ²³ The Marquis of Hamilton informed King Charles that not only did they threaten private individuals to sign "bot euien the whool bodie of the sessioun, and it is questionabill if they dou not the lyke to my self and counsall." ²⁴ "I must ingeniouslie confes", he writes in another letter to Charles, "ther is tou just cause for all thoes who heath not sined the Couenant to aprehand danger, the Covenanters houlding thatt all thoes who ar not with them ar against them, and so red us first out of the uay." ²⁵ According to the Earl of Traquair ministers who refused subscription were deposed without permission of the Bishop, while men of good quality were denied the benefits of the sacrament for refusing to subscribe. ²⁶ When General Robert Munro entered Aberdeen in the Covenanting interest one of his first acts was to apprehend twenty-six of the citizens who refused to sign the Covenant and send them as prisoners to Edinburgh. Irvine of Drum, Gordon of Haddo and many neighbouring lairds were arrested and also sent to Edinburgh. The towns of Banff and Peterhead were occupied and the surrounding district, already sorely impoverished, forced to contribute men, money, horses and arms. Baillie might be tolerant at times yet he could also be swayed by the multitude. "One of our ordinances was to sease on the rents of non-covenanters", he writes, "for we thought it bot reasonable, frae they syded with these /

these who put our lives and our lands for ever to seile, for the defence of our church and countrey, to employ for that cause a part of their rent for one year." ²⁷ According to Gordon, in certain cities - he mentions Edinburgh, St. Andrews, Glasgow, and Lanark - matters descended even to personal violence, "contumelys and exposing of many to injuryes and reproaches - and som wer threatned and beatne who durst refoose." ²⁸ The sway of intolerance increased with the growth of bitterness. An act of the General Convention of Burghs ratifying the Covenant ordained that no burgh should admit any burgess or send any commissioner to the Convention, but such as were well affected to the Covenant. ²⁹ There is evidence that in certain parts of the country, at least, compliance was a condition with every candidate for civic and municipal privileges. ³⁰ Indeed, subscription was an indispensable condition to participation in public life at all. ³¹

In one letter the Marquis of Hamilton informed Charles that the lawyers thought the Covenant justified by law ³² and in another that many counsellors of state declared likewise "which is a tenent so dangerous to monarchie." ³³ Baillie is proud to record the same fact. "The best lawers", he says, "both Hope, Nicolsone, and Stewart, being consulted by the King, does declare all our bypast proceedings to be legall." ³⁴ Yet to many it seemed otherwise. According to the Marquis of Hamilton the preservation of religion was but a pretext to blind the vulgar, the real aim being to link the people together to disobey all the King's commands except such as they pleased to accept. ³⁵ Delinquents summoned to synods /

synods were not slow to characterize the Covenant as "ane hypocriticall and traitorous Covenant."³⁶ To Robert Burnet, Biahop Burnet's father, the illegality of the Covenant was patent. "I neuer red in Historie of anie Couenant maid w^tout consent of the Lawfull Supreme Magistrat", he says, "bot resolved in oppen rebellion and taking of armes in end against y^e Prince."³⁷ To impose, he declares, upon men's consciences covenants, containing duties not only not commanded "per expressum in the word of God, bot in y^r Judgment praeter if not cotrarie y^r too", and that under pain of excommunication, seems hard to weak and tender consciences "and smells not a litle of the antichristian tyrannie of Rome."³⁸ Those who thought with Burnet could have but little in common with men who urged the acceptance of the Covenant "onder all the pains of hell"³⁹ and who would scarce reckon a man a Protestant who had not subscribed.⁴⁰

The general tenour of the new Bond was undoubtedly alarming to the moderate party. As time passed an interpretation of the terms of the Covenant arose to the effect that the total abolition of episcopacy was not intended⁴¹ yet the impression at the time - as Spalding notes⁴² - was that bishops were to be abolished. The common people and the nobility might sign extensively, the former through fear of popery, the latter, to a large extent at least, with an eye to material advantage, yet many hesitated to condemn a form of church government and ceremonies which they had vowed to obey. Moreover, to sanction armed resistance to the Royal authority was specially distasteful.

All of these considerations were keenly felt by the Aberdeen doctors, of whom the principal was Dr. John Forbes. No city in Scotland, it has been said, had ever seen so many learned divines and scholars at one time together, and with the passing of the group there fell more learning than was left behind in all Scotland.⁴³ When the emissaries of the Covenant came to Aberdeen, they were, as Baillie says, "hot coldly welcomed."⁴⁴ The doctors pointed out that the Confession which they were now asked to sign was, to a large degree, the Negative Confession of 1580 and that by accepting it they would be abjuring the Confession of 1557 - a Confession which did not condemn Episcopacy. They could not conscientiously sign a Covenant which, it would seem, must uproot the government of the church, its worship and doctrines. Neither King, Council, National Synod, nor any established judicatory by the Synod, they declared, had sent the Covenant to be subscribed. Such covenants, moreover, as had not the consent of the King were contrary to an act of 1585. They could not acknowledge, Dr. Guild declared, that the Articles of Perth were unlawful, nor, excluding the personal abuse thereof, could they condemn Episcopal government. The Covenant, it was argued, made a perpetual law regarding rites, and, according to their reading, even in the Covenant rites were lawful.⁴⁵ Indeed, the doctors had distinctly the better of the exchanges and the wonder is that the number of signatures was as great as it turned out to be.⁴⁶ Baillie, who expresses his fear of the doctors, is full of excuses for his brethren's want of success. They had, he says, great disadvantage in time and place and /

and lack of books.⁴⁷ The Aberdeen doctors had, however, pointed out the weakness in the armour and had given a lead to moderate opinion in the country.

Facts such as these plainly disprove that the National Covenant made the advocating of an accommodation impossible. The soil, far from being uncongenial - and had wise and moderate counsels prevailed - might have been cultivated successfully to a mediating solution of Scottish church polity. Alas, it was not to be so.

Charles, after he had recovered from the first shock of surprise at the overwhelming success of the Covenant and the wave of popular feeling, resolved to discard a Privy Council which had proved so helpless and choose for himself another intermediary in the person of James, Marquis of Hamilton. His character, Dr. S.R. Gardiner has said, seems to have been devoid of intellectual or moral strength, and he was therefore easily brought to fancy all future tasks easy and all present obstacles insuperable.⁴⁸ Baillie, while speaking of his "inclination to poperie"⁴⁹ yet describes him in terms of unbounded admiration.⁵⁰ Certainly his procrastinations and lack of power to make quick decisions made him more than ordinarily unsuited to reconcile two parties which, as Monteith says in his history, were the Guelfs and Ghibellins of Scotland.⁵¹ Charles's hatred of the Covenant was intense⁵² and his anger aggravated, as he said, by the fact that there were not more than five or six Lords of the Covenant to whom he had not done courtesies.⁵³ Hamilton, as events quickly passed, beheld with alarm, so he informs the /

the King, "the harts of al most eueri on of this kingdome
 alientend from ther soveran." ⁵⁴ By every means possible the
 Covenant had to be thwarted. Nothing he would leave undone
 "thatt can be thocht, be itt eather by thretes or brybes." ⁵⁵
 Yet the Marquis found it very difficult to keep himself from
 being panic-stricken. One day he counsels delay in the use of
 force yet in less than a week he speaks of "foorse, which is the
 onlie meines nou left to teach them obedianes." ⁵⁶ Charles laid
 it down as a primary condition to negotiations that the Covenant
 would have to be discarded but Hamilton soon informed him that
 there was absolutely no hope in that direction. ⁵⁷ They would
 sooner lose their lives than leave the Covenant. ⁵⁸ Indeed, in
 the eyes of the people, it was something sacred. ⁵⁹ It was a very
 "oath of God and could not be dissolved by man." ⁶⁰ As Drummond
 informed Charles II in later days, it struck so deep in their
 hearts, that no good could be done till it was rooted out. ⁶¹
 Charles was accordingly urged to yield. Archbishop Spottiswoode
 and the Earls of Traquair and Roxburgh advised him to proclaim
 that he had no intention to give offence by the Service Book and
 that he would not press till it was revised by the "most learned,
 godly, wise, and moderate persounes of the clergie." ⁶² Spottis-
 woode, writing to the two mentioned noblemen, suggested that the
 King should publicly declare that he would not press the Service
 Book, Canons or High Commission, as there was no other method of
 settling matters and quietening the people. ⁶³ The anger of the
 populace was especially roused against the bishops. Hamilton
 reported /

reported to his master that the Covenanters demanded the limitation of the power of bishops according to certain caveats established by parliament^{b4} while Spalding chronicles that the country could not look for any settlement of grievances "so long as bishops stood, who were one of the three estates of parliament, followed still the king, and in matters questionable their votes cuist the ballance; therefore they conclude to goe on upon ane course, and sweip out the bishops of both nations, crop and root."^{b5} Accordingly, to the demand for the recall of the Service Book was added that for the elimination of the bishops from the Privy Council - a list swelled by the further popular cry for a free Parliament and a free General Assembly to settle all disputes. By August 1638 Hamilton had come twice between England and Scotland in a desperate effort at negotiation and finally, on the 20th of September, made his third appearance in Edinburgh with the news that there was to be a free Assembly, a free Parliament and that the Court of High Commission was to be abolished.

Meanwhile all attention was focussed on the coming Assembly and men could but talk of what proceedings it would possibly take. "It is like to be the most frequent and considerable one that ever was in this land", wrote Baillie, at the same time stating that he hoped to see Church and State put in a better case than they had been for thirty years.^{b6}

III. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Guthry's Memoirs. pp. 24-25.
2. Politics and Religion. W.L. Mathieson. Vol. I p. 387.
3. Baillie. Vol. I p. 237.
4. Carlyle. Letters and Speeches. iii. 128.
5. Politics and Religion. W.L. Mathieson. Vol. I p. 387.
6. A History of Scotland. C.S. Terry. p. 334.
7. History of Scotland. Andrew Lang. Vol. III p. 30.
8. See e.g. Wilson's "History of Scottish Affairs" in
"Transactions of the Literary and Antiquarian Society
of Perth". Vol. I p. 13.
- Baillie. Vol. I pp. 88-89.
- Guthry's Memoirs. pp. 34-35.
9. Reid. The Divinity Professors in the University of Glasgow,
1640-1903. p. 18.
10. Narrative of Mr. James Nimmo. 1654-1709. Scot. Hist. Socy.
1889. Edited W.G. Scott-Moncrieff. p. 36.
11. Do. Introduction. p. xviii.
12. Baillie. Vol. I p. 64.
13. Burnet. Vol. I p. 276.
14. Wodrow. Vol. I p. 123.
15. Do. p. 330.
16. See e.g. Baillie. Vol. I p. 89.
17. Gordon. Vol. I. p. 47.
18. Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark.
MDCXXIII - MDCCIX. Edinburgh. Abbotsford Club.
p. 23.
19. So Grub. Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Vol. III
p. 3.
20. For the case of Spang see Baillie. Vol. I p. 109.
21. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 63. Spalding. Vol. III pp. 98 & 248.
22. H.M.C. 5th Report. Forbes of Craigievar MSS. p. 629.
23. Spalding. Vol. I. pp. 114 & 124.
24. Hamilton Papers. p. 4.
25. Do. p. 10.
26. H.M.C. 9th Report. Traquair MSS. p. 259. Part II.
27. Baillie. Vol. I p. 213.
28. Gordon. Vol. I p. 45.
29. H.M.C. 9th Report. Traquair MSS. p. 254. Part II.
30. Hawick Archaeological Society. Transactions. 1864.
Notices of Upper Teviotdale during the Covenanting
Times. J.A.H. Murray. p. 70.
31. D.N.B. Vol. XXXV. Article "John Maitland".
(Osmund Airy). p. 360.
32. H.M.C. 11th Report. Part VI. 1887. p. 95.
33. Hamilton Papers. p. 9.
34. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 65.
35. Hamilton Papers. p. 37.

36. Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife. 1611-87.
Abbotsford Club. p. 121.
37. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Edinburgh.
1904. Vol. II. Burnet-Leighton Papers. 1648-168-.
Edited H.C. Foxcroft. p. 337.
38. Do. p. 336.
39. Baillie. Vol. I p. 239.
40. History of the Troubles of Great Britain particularly in
Scotland. 1633-1650. Robert Monteith. p. 23.
41. See "Reasones for not abjuring of Episcopacie" in Miscellany
of the Maitland Club. Vol. II. Part II. Edinburgh.
1840. p. 413 seq.
42. Spalding. Vol. I. p. 117.
43. Gordon. Vol. III p. 243.
44. Baillie. Vol. I p. 97.
45. Spalding Vol. I. p. 58.
Gordon. Vol. I pp. 91-92.
46. D.N.B. Article "Alexander Henderson" in Vol. XXV.
500 signatures were obtained in the town, as well as
those of 50 ministers of the district. p. 392.
47. Baillie. Vol. I pp. 122 & 97.
48. D.N.B. Vol. XXIV. Article "James Hamilton". p. 180.
49. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 75.
50. Do. pp. 115, 124, 125, 143 & 202.
51. Monteith's History. p. 23.
52. H.M.C. 11th Report. Part VI. 1887. p. 95.
53. H.M.C. 12th Report. Part IV. 1888. p. 504.
54. Hamilton Papers. p. 3.
55. H.M.C. 11th Report. Part VI. 1887. p. 95.
56. Hamilton Papers. pp. 8 & 10.
57. Do. p. 15.
58. Do. p. 6.
59. Diary of the Public Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hope of
Craighall. 1633-1645. Bannatyne Club. 1843.
p. 99.
- Wodrow. Vol. I p. 95.
- Defoe. Part III. p. 194.
60. Defoe. Part III. pp. 195 & 253.
61. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 439.
62. H.M.C. 9th Report. 1883-4. Traquair MSS. p. 259.
Part II.
63. Do.
64. Hamilton Papers. p. 5.
65. Spalding. Vol. I. p. 87.
66. Baillie. Vol. I. pp. 110 & 111.

IV.

THE GLASGOW GENERAL ASSEMBLY of 1638.

I do not require, of course, to go into a detailed account of this famous Assembly, our interest being confined to its relationship to accommodation movements.

The trial of the bishops was the principal business. A complaint was drawn out and signed by a long list of noblemen, barons, burgesses, and ministers charging them with having violated the conditions upon which they received their bishoprics; with teaching Arminian and Popish doctrines; with having exercised the powers of diocesan prelates; with having given their aid to bring in the Court of High Commission, the Book of Canons, and the Liturgy; and finally, with being guilty "of excessive drinking, whoring, playing at cards and dice, swearing, profane speaking, excessive gaming, profaning of the Sabbath, contempt of the public ordinances and private family exercises, mocking of the power of preaching, prayer and spiritual conference, and sincere professors; besides with bribery, simony, selling of commissariats' places, lies, perjuries, dishonest dealing in civil bargains, abusing of their vassals." Other charges could hardly be mentioned.

John, Earl of Rothes, in his "Relation" further brings the charge that they had neglected "the observations of the caveats and conditions taken of them by the Generall Assemblie, which they purposlie omitted out of their Ratificatione in Parliament; and haveing encroatched so by degrees, as they have obtained ane uncontrollable /

uncontrolable dominione over the church, by censuring at their plesour in judicatories not allowed by the lawes of this state, and being computable to no other judicatories bot Generall Assemblies, which they have alwayes corrupted or supprest." ²

Nicoll also repeats the charge that the bishops did not submit themselves to the trial of Presbyteries and Provincial and General Assemblies and further complains of them that they had taken half the voice of Parliament, Council, Session and Exchequer, that they had usurped Presbyteries and Synods, and had overturned the doctrines and liberties of the church. ³ The probation of the libels was referred to a Committee and the evidence, such as it was, must have been very one-sided. The charges regarding morality are most astounding and even though they were true, as Gordon says, modesty and charity would have pleaded for the suppression of these crimes, "it being questionable whither the acting or divulging them wer the mor scandalouse. It was thought that, propter honorem sacerdotij, thinges of this nature should have been suppressed." ⁴

The bishops were inevitably deposed both from their bishoprics and the ministry, eight of them being excommunicated. As excommunication involved the forfeiture of every civil right and meant untold suffering it is painful to read in presbytery records that the brethren were ordained to make intimation in their several churches "that in case the excommunicat Prelates come in their parochines, that no man receive them under the pain of censures of the kirk." ⁵

This was vengeance indeed, their real crime being - so says Monteith ⁶ - that they were bishops. Baillie gives it as his opinion /

opinion that not three of the fourteen would have been unwilling to lay their bishoprics at the feet of the Assembly and, after penance enjoined, to return to their old ministry. They were only deterred, he avers, by the King's wrath and by the hope that he would overcome the covenanting forces.⁷ This can hardly have been the opinion of the Assembly, however, else the summary processes are inexplicable. Not that there was no commiseration for the bishops or even audible sympathy. Many spoke particularly for the Bishop of Dunkeld, stating that he did not approve the late courses of the bishops.⁸ Indeed, Baillie and Ramsay appear to have been the leaders of a small group who, in certain cases, favoured deposition without excommunication.⁹ The plight of the "poure bisshopes and ministers" was so desperate that Hamilton himself wrote to the King on their behalf. "I humblie beshich your Ma^{tt}i, for saying that in honoure you will be obliged to relife them, and if your Ma^{tt}i should be plesed to send heire 1000" in specie, itt uould not onlie relife ther wantes bot proufe yusfull to you perhapes in maters of greateres consequense."¹⁰

The Assembly, however, had determined that bishops should go and go they did. By the 20th of December, when it rose, not only had it deposed all of them and excommunicated some but it had also nullified the Book of Canons, the new Liturgy, and the Five Articles of Perth, besides abolishing the High Court of Commission. Hamilton had repeatedly informed Charles that nothing short of the total abolition of episcopacy was intended,¹¹ and he was right, for the whole ecclesiastical edifice which had been reared with such pains /

pains by Charles and his father was swept away. Baillie might flatter himself that the Church had got a "full purgation",¹² as he put it, but there were not a few who thought that matters had gone too far. A great opportunity had presented itself and by the Assembly's violent reactionary proceedings was inevitably lost. A generation was now living that was accustomed to the Episcopal form of church government. Had all abuses, accordingly, been swept away it is just possible that a moderate form of that polity might have united all ranks of the people to a degree that has not since been achieved. As early as June 15, 1638 Hamilton had pointed out the possibility to Charles. "If you will not be content to admitt the Couenant to remaine", he said, "call a generall assemblie when ye may expectt the Bishopes to be limited to a sertan caveatt which was mad att ther first re-establishment, the 5 artikils of Perth abrogated, and the admissioun of ministers by the presbiters, and all this to be ratified in the ensheuing parll(iament) do not expectt nor loucke for ani thing bot disobediens." ¹³ That this advice was not unavailing is shown by the fact that on the following 27th of July Hamilton received instructions to go back to Edinburgh and to allow the election of an Assembly and a parliament. He was to protest against any proposal to abolish episcopacy and - be this noted - he might assent to any plea for making bishops responsible to future assemblies. ¹⁴ Nor would this have been altogether unacceptable. Even Baillie, speaking of the Commissioner's arrival at Dalkeith on the 15th of September on the way to the Assembly says "the King's will was exceedingly gracious /

gracious to the most of our desyres" and one of the particulars was - "Bishops subjected to the Assemblie." ¹⁵ All such hopes however, were precluded by the subsequent conduct of the Assembly. Coersion direct and indirect did its work. Gordon affirms - and there is no reason to doubt his word - that for years after 1638 it was widely held by knowing men that there was no dubiety whatever that many of the ministry came to Glasgow with the intention of voting very differently from what they actually did but that, after their coming there, "ther wer many of them laide off by the influence of half a dosen of leading men, pairtly through feare, and pairtly out of despaire that ther votes would doe any good; and therfor resolved for to serve the tynes, and runne with the streame rather than with ther consciences." ¹⁶

In the main this is reiterated by Fraser, the northern chronicler

"Most of the nobles corrupted, the gentry byassed, churchmen amused and amazed, and such as were sound among them overawed that they durst not vent themselves among ther bretheren, feareing to be betrayed and discovered, and therefore lurked with a seeming compliance, judging Qui bene latuit bene ne vixit." ¹⁷

Their so doing, however, allowed the oppertunity to pass. It was for Robert Leighton, after the Restoration, to face the problem once more.

IV. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Large Declaration. pp. 209-219. The complaint was brought before the Presbytery of Edinburgh.
2. Rothes's Relation. p. 1.
3. Nicoll's Diary. p. 204.
4. Gordon. Vol. II p. 101.
5. Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark. 1623-1709. Abbotsford Club. pp. 17 & 18.
6. Monteith's History. p. 37.
7. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 151.
8. Do. p. 154.
9. Do. p. 155.
10. Hamilton Papers. pp. 54 & 55.
11. Do. pp. 40 & 60.
12. Baillie. Vol. I p. 185.
13. Hamilton Papers. p. 11.
14. D.N.B. Vol. XXIV. Article "James Hamilton". (S.R. Gardiner). p. 180.
15. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 104.
16. Gordon. Vol. II. p. 175.
17. Fraser. Chronicles of the Frasers. p. 273.

V.

THE SOLEMN LEAGUE and COVENANT of 1643.

Events moved quickly after the Glasgow General Assembly of 1638. A struggle seemed apparent. The First Bishops' War - as it was called - fortunately, however, ended without a single drop of blood being shed.

The General Assembly met on the 12th of August, 1639 and on the 17th enacted "that the Service Book, Books of Canons and Ordination and the High Commission be still rejected; that the Articles of Perth be no more practised; that Episcopal government and the civil powers and places of kirkmen, be holden still as unlawful in this kirk; that the pretended Assemblies at Linlithgow in 1606 and 1608, at Glasgow in 1610, at Aberdeen in 1616, at Perth in 1618, be hereafter accounted as null and of none effect; and that for preservation of religion and preventing all such evils in time coming, General Assemblies, rightly constitute as the proper and competent judge of all matters ecclesiastical, hereafter be kept yearly and oftener pro re nata, as occasion and necessity shall require; the necessity of these occasional Assemblies being first remonstrate to his Majesty by humble supplication; as also that kirk sessions, presbyteries and synodical assemblies be constitute and observed according to the order of the kirk." ¹.

Naturally the Covenanters were jubilant. "This day", writes Sir Thomas Hope in his diary, "the Assemblie closit the point /

point of Episcopacie, and declarit it unlauffull, and contrair to Godis word, to the unspeakabill joy of all them that feiris the Lord, and waittis for his salvatioun." ^{2.} Charles, for his part, was alarmed at this root and branch work, not being able for one moment to consent to Episcopacy being termed "unlauffull" and "contrair to Godis word" in the Covenanting sense. His position is summed up in a letter from Whitehall dated October 10, 1639, where he says that, though he abolished episcopacy as contrary to the constitutions of the kirk, he never consented to declare the same unlawful.

"If wee do acknowledge or consent that episcopacie is unlawfull in the Kirk of Scotland, though as yow haue sett it doune in your consenting to the Act, the word unlawfull may seeme to haue onely a relation to the constitutiones of the Kirk, yet the construction thereof doth runne so doubtfully that it may be too probablie inferred that the same calling is acknowledged by vs to be unlawfull in any other churches in our dominiones." ^{3.}

"Wee tak God to witnes that we haue permitted them to do many things in this Assemblie for establishing of peace contrarie to our own judgement, and if in this point a rupture happen, wee cannot help it, the fault is on ther part." ^{4.}

Unfortunately too, it has to be confessed, the ensuing period was one of unparalleled intolerance. Not only was the Covenant renewed but it was ordained that all should be compelled to swear to it, that it should be administered particularly to all Papists and others suspected of disaffection and that the Privy Council should be requested to add civil pains to ecclesiastical censures in cases of refusal. In accordance with this request the Privy Council did pass an Act making the subscription of the Covenant compulsory on the whole nation. ^{5.} It is a constant remark of

Wodrow that religious and civil liberty stand and fall together and hitherto the Covenant had been the banner of both. Henceforth, however, it was to become an instrument of oppression and intolerance. The Covenanters had acquired the very power they denied to the King and though they considered it wrong to coerce the people into the acceptance of an unwanted Liturgy it was to be right to compel the Episcopalians to subscribe a Covenant however abhorrent it might be to them. An easy matter it is to illustrate from contemporary sources the prevailing intolerance.⁷

Uniformity was now the grand vision and aim of Covenanting aspirations. A Parliament that met in Edinburgh on the 17th of August, 1641 Charles attended in person, and, no doubt to his chagrin but without demur, the Acts of Parliament of June 1640 were confirmed, overthrowing Episcopacy, establishing Presbytery, and also approving the desire of the Scots for uniformity of religion and church government with England. An Assembly at St. Andrews on the 20th of July had passed an Act "for drawing up a Catechism, Confession of Faith, Directory of Public Worship, and a form of Kirk Government" thus demonstrating the growing demand for uniformity and foreshadowing the Solemn League and Covenant and the Westminster Assembly. "In the year 1642", says Wishart in his Memoirs, "the Covenanters of both kingdoms began to lay aside the mask and carry on matters more openly."⁸ The Privy Council, certainly, was somewhat wavering in its attitude to the question of uniformity if not indeed positively deceptive. Writing from Edinburgh on the 19th of August 1642 they enclosed

a petition from the last General Assembly by which the King could perceive their earnestness for unity of religion and uniformity of church government in the three kingdoms.⁹ Ten days later they again petitioned the King to the same effect.¹⁰ Despite these definite and positive statements, however, we find a remarkable change of tone in their correspondence with the Privy Council of England. They had nothing less in view, they declared, than a quarrel with England, on account of religion, because they knew that the civil laws and constitution of church government were different in both kingdoms - they would be as far from questioning the religion and liberties of England, as they would be careful in maintaining their own, remembering the great rule of equity not to do unto others, what they would not should be done to themselves.¹¹ A new spirit had come into being, a spirit that was to find its meet expression in the Solemn League and Covenant at the implications of which we shall now look.

Presbyterianism was "de iure divino", the only form of church government bearing the divine impress, all others being spurious and unauthentic - this was the calm belief of practically every Covenanter else all their doings at this time are quite unintelligible. It was the conviction of Kirkton,¹² Lord Warriston,¹³ Baillie,¹⁴ (who, however, was not so thorough-going, and at times, more moderate) and all typical Presbyterians of the day.¹⁵ It was a position well known to Leighton, as his library testifies,¹⁶ though there is no evidence that he ever held it even in his Presbyterian days. Accordingly, the premises granted, it was the plain /

plain duty of Scotland to induce England to accept the one divinely authorised church government, and share in the grand vision of uniformity that dazzled the eyes of the northern kingdom. "Christ will not lose any of His flock which He bought so dear", said Leighton to his Newbattle congregation, "and for their sake He will, at one time or another, repair our breaches, and establish His throne in these kingdoms." ¹⁷ (This was the phrase the Covenanters used in speaking of the establishment of uniformity). "There is", wrote his brother-Covenanter Baillie, "a golden occasion in hand, if improved, to gett England conforme in worship and government to the rest of the Reformed." ¹⁸ Their motives, they declared, were quite disinterested. The Privy Council, in recommending Alexander Henderson, the bearer of a supplication from the General Assembly, to the King, "for an uniformity in religion and kirk government throughout all His Majesty's dominions" state it is "as a matter of great piety and importance, carrying nothing with it but a zeal for the true religion, a tender care of his own happiness, and a love of the public weal." ¹⁹

It is not, of course, necessary for us to narrate the genesis and formation of the Solemn League and Covenant. Only in so far as it relates to our subject are we interested in it. The terms were to preserve the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, "in doctrine, worship, discipline and government", to reform religion in England and Ireland "in doctrine, worship, discipline and government" according to the Word of God, and the example of the /

the best reformed churches, to bring the churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of church government, directory for worship and catechising, to extirpate popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy and schism, to defend the privileges of the parliament, and the person and authority of the King, and to discover all incendiaries and malignants.²⁰ Such were the vital clauses of this notable bond - "a document", it has been claimed, "the noblest in its essential nature and principles, of all that are recorded among the international transactions of the world."²¹

Outwardly, at least, the English reception was cordial enough. "Our land now, I hope, in a happie tyme", wrote Baillie, "hath entered, with fastings and prayer, in a league with England, without any opposition".²² Great and indeed, extravagant hopes were placed in the Covenant. Leighton, like his brother-Covenanters, was interested²³ but warned his hearers not to be over-optimistic. "Let us not be so foolish", he said, "as to promise ourselves impunity on account of our relation to God, as His Church in covenant with Him. If once we thought so, sure our experience hath undeceived us. And let not what we have suffered harden us, as if the worst were past."²⁴ And indeed, Leighton had only too good grounds for apprehension. In so far as the new Covenant was a defensive bond it was due, not so much to Charles's intrigues with the Irish Catholics, as the fear, that he was not to be trusted to abide by the consequences of his defeat in Scotland, should he win the day in England. In reality, however, it was revolutionary /

revolutionary and aggressive rather than defensive. To begin with, it was vastly less popular and excited far greater opposition than the National Covenant of 1638. The loyalty of the English people was exceedingly dubious. Not one of the leading Puritans of the Long Parliament was a Presbyterian and the adoption of Presbyterianism was only forced on the Puritans by political considerations. Indeed it was declared by Clarendon "that very much the major part of the members that continued in the parliament-house were cordially affected to the established government."²⁵

Although the Covenant was imposed on practically all classes it was very generally disliked and in many cases, evaded. Indeed, Presbyterianism never seems to have been fully enforced except in London and Lancashire. In Scotland the opposition of nobility and gentry was especially noted and commented upon. "Though the Clergy and People", says Monteith in his history, "gave Way to the Passion they had to see Episcopacy ruined, the Altars pulled down, and the Liturgy abolished in England: And that they hoped to establish their Service and Presbyterian Government, in order, by that means, to secure themselves on that side, from whence they always dreaded some Innovation; yet it was believed, that the chief of the Nobility and Gentry had more regard to what concerned the political government."²⁶

"It wes aganis the kingis will"²⁷ - which was sufficient justification for royalists in their opposition. That in many parts of the country "the gentrie and most part of the communalitie refused to subscriyve"²⁸ is proved, furthermore, by presbytery books. /

books. It is only fair to the Covenanters to say they did make some attempt to give an "explication of what points in it may be difficile"²⁹ nevertheless, nothing is commoner of this time than to read of the many conscientious difficulties man had in subscribing.³⁰ Especially was this the case in respect of the third Article of the Covenant "medling with the mantenans and richtis of parliamentis and liberteis of the kingdome."³¹ Sir Thomas Hope tells with what enthusiasm he renewed his vow until he came to this very article. "I scrupillit", he says, "to sueir to maytene, the Parliament of another kingdome, and liberties thairoff."³²

Although the Covenanters always denied that the Covenant was framed against the King and were loud in their claims of loyalty³³ - and indeed in after years claimed that it was conducive to the Restoration³⁴ - Royalists called it the "rebellious Covenant."³⁵ Moreover, not only did the Independents pour all their disdain upon it, but Presbyterians like Richard Baxter, one of the leaders, strangely objected. The English interpretation of the Covenant, it became apparent, differed essentially from the Scottish. Philip Nye in preaching at St. Margaret's before the House of Commons and the Assembly, when they swore to the Covenant made it plain that they were not binding themselves to reform the English church after the model of the Scottish. "We shall humbly bow and kiss their lips that can . . . help us unto the nearest uniformity with the word and mind of Christ in this great work of reformation"³⁶ - uniformity with the word and mind of Christ, not with the Church of Scotland. The National Covenant had been, as its name implies,

a movement of the country generally, bound together to resist the encroachments of Charles's and Laud's arbitrary power in church government, whereas the Solemn League and Covenant implied an unprovoked invasion of England by the Presbyterians with the help of an English faction to bring about the acceptance of an alien church government - which was the very count the Scots had against the Stuart House regarding their treatment of the Scottish Church. Grumbings grew more and more audible as the implications of the Solemn League grew more tangible in the shape of increased taxation - though Wishart, in his "Memoirs", grossly exaggerated this fact.³⁷ Better, it was said, to live under Prelacy with one taxation a year than now with payments every month.³⁸ Exception, too, was taken to the dominating influence of Argyll. "The mutuall League and Covenant," the complaint was voiced, "was the Marquis of Argyle his covenant".³⁹ No doubt in a vast majority of cases subscribers of the Covenant considered they had abjured all Episcopacy⁴⁰ but this was not universally so, many giving their signatures on the understanding that "by prelacy we mean not all Episcopacy, but only the form which is here described."⁴¹ This, as we shall see later, was Leighton's line of argument.⁴² We have already noted that in the administration of the National Covenant moderate opinion had been somewhat alienated by the violence, and, indeed, oppression, used to obtain subscriptions. The case, however, was much worse in connection with the Solemn League and Covenant. Proofs of this could be easily quoted from all over the country.⁴³

There /

There is something touching in the plaintive words of the gentle Leighton -

"I know not what can be said to clear them of a very great Sin, that not only framed such an Engine, but violently opposed it upon all ranks of men, not ministers and other public persons only, but the whole body and community of the people thereby engaging such droves of poor ignorant persons, to they know not what, and, to speak freely, to such a hodge-podge of various concernments, Religions and Civil, as Church Discipline and Government, the privileges of Parliament and Liberties of subjects, and condign Punishment of Malignants, things hard enough for the wisest and learnedest to draw the just lines of, and to give plain definitions and decisions of them, and therefore certainly as far off from the reach of poor country people's understanding, as from the true interest of their souls; and yet to tie them by a Religious and Sacred Oath either to know all these, or to contend for them blindfold without knowing them; - Can there be instanced a greater Oppression and Tyranny over Consciences than this?" ^{44.}

V. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Acts of Assembly 1639 in Peterkin's Records.
2. Sir Thomas Hope. Diary. p. 104.
3. H.M.C. 9th Report. 1883-4. Traquair MSS. p. 250.
Part II.
4. Do.
5. Peterkin. Records. p. 207.
6. Andrew. Vol. I pp. 232 & 245. Vol. II p. 8.
7. Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark.
1623-1709. Abbotsford Club. p. 19.
Gordon. Vol. III p. 249.
Baillie. Vol. I p. 273.
Do. p. 278.
Do. p. 282.
8. Wishart's Memoirs. p. 24.
9. H.M.C. 11th Report. Part VI. 1887. p. 110.
10. Miscellany of the Maitland Club. Vol. IV. Part I.
1847. Hamilton Papers. pp. 160 & 161.
11. Do. p. 161.
12. Kirkton. See his approval of James Wood's declaration.
p. 208.
13. Diary. Introduction. p. 14.
14. Baillie. Vol. II. p. 411 where he approves of a book
proving the claim.
15. Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, first Earl of Ancrum
and his son William, third Earl of Lothian. Vol. II
pp. 253 & 254.
16. See Transactions of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society.
Vol. I. 1886-9. p. 60. Part IV.
17. Leighton's Works. Vol. IV p. 527.
18. Baillie. Vol. II p. 180.
19. Miscellany of the Maitland Club. Vol. IV. Part I.
1847. Hamilton Papers. p. 161.
20. See "Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution.
1628-1860." S.R. Gardiner. pp. 187-190.
21. History of the Church of Scotland. W.M. Hetherington.
pp. 333 & 334.
22. Baillie. Vol. II p. 103.
23. This is shown by one of his sermons. See Works.
Vol. VII p. 154.
24. Leighton's Works. Vol. IV p. 692.
25. Clarendon. Great Rebellion. Vol. II p. 89.
26. Monteith's History. pp. 149 & 150.
27. Spalding. Vol. II p. 166.
28. Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie.
1631-1654. Spalding Club. 1843. pp. 41 & 42.
29. Selection from the minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club.
p. 12.

30. e.g. Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie.
1631-1654. Spalding Club. 1843. pp. 41, 42 & 179.
31. Spalding. Vol. II p. 146.
32. Diary. p. 197.
33. Spalding. Vol. II p. 179.
- Burnet. Vol. I p. 76.
34. Wodrow. Vol. I p. 61.
35. A Book of Record. Diary of Patrick, First Earl of
Strathmore. 1684-1689. Edited A.H. Millar.
Seot. Hist. Socy. 1890. p. 21.
36. Gardiner's "Great Civil War". I. 276 and reference.
37. Wishart's Memoirs. p. 29.
38. Selections from the minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club.
p. 48.
39. Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie.
1631-1654. Spalding Club. 1843. p. 43.
40. Defoe's Memoirs. Part III p. 227.
41. Baxter's Life and Times. Vol. I p. 48.
42. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII pp. 184, 187 & 188.
43. Baillie. Vol. II pp. 102 & 103.
- Spalding. Vol. II p. 177.
- Miscellany of the Maitland Club. Vol. III. 1846. p. 206.
- Selections from the minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club.
p. 118. Also p. 16.
- Nicoll's Diary. p. 8.
- Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie.
1631-1654. Spalding Club. 1843. p. 51.
- Sir James Turner's Memoirs. p. 148.
44. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII p. 189.

VI.

MONTROSE. THE ENGAGEMENT.

The period following upon the Solemn League and Covenant was for the most part barren and uninteresting. A time it was of bitter sectarian and partisan feeling, a feeling which increased rather than decreased with the passing years.

In pursuit of our subject, however, we fasten attention solely on what had relationship to the accommodation movement. Despite uncompromising party-strife there were other influences at work which were to grow in volume and bear fruit as against the day when the idealists would be ready to venture on their via media.

And first we come to the historic figure of the Marquis of Montrose. This extraordinary man, one of the greatest and most romantic figures of his time, was by nature a soldier and a patriot. He was a sincere, though not intolerant Presbyterian, somewhat indifferent to forms of church government, and probably not altogether unsympathetic to a moderate form of episcopacy. "Bishops", he declared with almost his last breath, "I care not for them. I never intended to advance their interests." "That churchmen have competency", he wrote, "is agreeable to the law of God and man. But to invest them into great estates and principal offices of the State, is neither convenient for the Church, for the King, nor for the State." And so when he returned to Scotland at the age of twenty-four he was alarmed to see the country at the mercy of Hamilton whom he despised and of a Churchman and Englishman, Laud, whom /

whom he suspected. He signed the National Covenant of 1638. Doubtless it was the designation "National" that was the chief attraction to him as he could thus demonstrate his resentment of English interference and his dislike of the bishops, who, rather than the nobility, received the King's favour. If the Covenant represented nothing less than "the preservation of religion, the honor and dignity of the King, the lawes of the land, the freedom of the natione"¹ Montrose could hardly refuse to sign. Yet it is easy to exaggerate the part he played, to say that "his political idea was practically a Reform Bill which would give representation and influence to the People as represented by the lesser Barons, gentry and educated classes"² - an exaggeration also to claim that he was "modern" with scarcely an idea that is not modern, that "the application was modern too"³ and that he "anticipated the freer life of modern Scotland."⁴ There is little doubt pique formed an integral part of his decision. He was jealous of Argyll who had obtained the ascendancy in the councils of the Covenanters and we know by a letter from Lord Carnegie to Lord Sinolair dated 7th June 1640 that thus early Montrose was chagrined in his rivalry with General Leslie.⁵ Even Fraser admits that he was full of ambition and "vain of his victories, and proud of his conquest which was his bane and brack,"⁶ while Baillie affirms that his pride was intolerable.⁷ Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that he did conscientiously change his opinion. "I engaged in the first covenant", he said to the Parliament of 1650, "and was faithfull to it untill I perceived some /

some privat persones, under colour of religion, intended to wring the autherity from the King, and to seize on it for themselves; and then it was thought fit for the clearing of honest men that a bond should be subscribed wherein the security of religion was sufficiently provided for; this satisfied my conscience, and I subscribed it." ⁸ In a letter of 1643 which is important as reflecting the state of his mind at the time when he paused just before joining the royal cause he states his resolve to adhere to the third point of the Covenant touching the King's honour and authority "since our religioune and libertie was alreddie so wholie and firmly secured, whiche, wer thay in hayserd or by all appeirance possably questioned, I should als willingly mainteine as any els alyve." ⁹ In his opinion the Covenanters had gone too far and could not justify their proceedings like good subjects. ¹⁰ Hamilton had been got rid of, but now there was the more unbearable Argyll. Hitherto there had been a misguided and wilful King, now there was like to be no King at all. Episcopacy had been abolished but now there was to be a clerical Presbyterian predominance more odious than that of the bishops. And so Montrose threw in his lot with Charles, the advent of the Solemn League and Covenant marking his definite secession. If he had his difficulties with the National Covenant the more revolutionary Solemn League and Covenant was too much for him. "As for that you call the League and Covenant", he said, "I thank God I was never in it and so could not brake it." ¹¹ Naturally the full viols of covenanting wrath were poured out on the "Apostate". Baillie's dislike is often noted on his pages /

pages¹² while the hatred of the ministers pursued him to the very scaffold.¹³ Even to Leighton he was the "cruel enemy"¹⁴ though Baillie complains of his over-great lenity.

There was just the possibility of Montrose being the centre of a moderate party but the movement came to nothing, he being too engrossed in his military exploits, exploits at first successful but eventually disastrous. The cruelties and intolerance, too, following Philiphaugh, it is plain, were a serious set-back to any mediating party. For example, the Provincial Assembly of Fife in October 1645 supplicated Parliament that, as they had heard their zealous purpose of executing justice upon those bloody men whom God had put in their hands, so just and laudable a resolution might speedily be put in execution.¹⁵ The Synod of Galloway craved that the sword of justice might be impartially drawn against those persons in bonds who had lifted up their hands against the Lord, the sworn Covenant, and the afflicted Kirk.¹⁶ A remonstrance of the Commission of the General Assembly to the Parliament reminds them how often the Commission had expressed their earnest desires for justice to be executed against those from whose treacherous designs and bloody practices had issued that flood of calamities which had overflowed the face of the land, threatening all the inhabitants with ruin, and swallowing many thousands in destruction, and how displeasing unto the supreme Judge of the world, how dangerous to themselves, how grievous unto the heart of the Lord's people, and how advantageous unto the enemy their former delays had been.¹⁷ When churchmen could /

could speak in such terms what chances awaited the peace party? The outlook was indeed dark.

The growth of Independency was another factor to be taken into consideration, the Scots being greatly alarmed. As early as 1643 Baillie had reason to complain of this¹⁸ and in the following year noted with alarm its growth in the English army. Between Independents and Presbyterians there was little love lost. "As yet", wrote Baillie, "a Presbytrie to this people is conceived to be a strange monster."²⁰ Indeed, they had but little sympathy with Presbyterian ideas - a fact pointed out by Charles as early as April, 1643 -

"Tho they seeme to desire a uniformitie of church government with our kingdom of Scotland, doe no more intend, and er als farre from allowing the church governement by law established there, or indeed anie church governement quhatsoever, as they ar from consenting to the episcopall."²¹

Independency was for Baillie an "evill" and the "mother and true fountaine" of all English church distractions.²² In one of his letters he refers to the principal tenets of the seventeenth century Independents. The power of ecclesiastical censures lies with congregational presbyteries. They grant the divine right and use of Synods but deny their jurisdiction over any congregation. The congregational consistory hold the power of ordination and deposition of officers and the excommunication of members. They admit none to membership of their congregations of whose true grace and regeneration they have no true evidence. They make it necessary to have all the men who are communicants present at every /

every act of jurisdiction of the consistory. They allow every capable man to preach publicly in the face of the church. They do not censure the denial of paedobaptism. They preach a "libertie of conscience" and a "tolleration for all religions."²³ Some of these principles, it will be noted, flavour strongly of Anabaptism and demonstrate their origin, Independency owing its inception to Anabaptism.²⁴ The Episcopalian Wishart shows by his Memoirs that he liked Independency as ill as Presbyterianism -

"Emperors, kings, popes, bishops, presbyteries, synods, councils - however free and general - they reject with cursings and anathemas, as anti-christian and devilish inventions Ecclesiastical orders, especially the laying-on of hands, of which the Presbyterians are willing to retain some show, they abhor as a magical rite Learning and learned men they hate like poison, as enemies of Christian piety. They give ear to no preacher who does not profess divine inspiration The Eucharist they pollute in foul and abominable ways. Besides the Arian heresy and other impieties of the like nature, these notable reformers of the age have recalled from hell all the ravings and obscenities of the Carpocrations, Adamites and Gnostics."²⁵

Baillie's language is not so violent or so biassed as Wishart's yet both are agreed in one reason for their dislike viz:- the suspicion of heresy attaching to the Independents. Wishart, we see, accuses them of Arianism. Baillie adds Anabaptism, Antinomianism and Socinianism.²⁶ Fraser speaks of Cromwell's army as "wholly by the millenary principle."²⁷ In days of stringent orthodoxy even such a suspicion was enough to condemn them in Scottish eyes, their theologians such as James Wood, Rutherford's colleague at St. Andrews, standing out to refute them.²⁸ It became a favourite "exercise" at Presbytery meetings to controvert Independency.²⁹ As a form of church government it was peculiarly obnoxious /

obnoxious to the northern kingdom. "Make me everie congregation ane absolute and independent church," says Baillie, "over which Presbytries and Generall Assemblies have no power of censure, bot onlie of charitable admonition, my witt sees not how incontinent a Nationall Church should not fall into unspeakable confusions."³⁰ Leighton, we know, from his visits to London conceived a dislike to the system³¹ but he, and even Baillie, perceived that between Presbyterianism and Independency there were undoubted affinities - which is proved by the fact that in later days when the Scottish Presbyterians became divided between Resolutioners and Protestors many of the latter were supporters of Independency.³² Even Baillie, at one time, had hoped to join forces with the Independents to overthrow Episcopacy³³ and had contemplated a scheme of accommodation with them.³⁴ This assuredly was a most interesting fact for our present enquiry.

And now we come to a date of ominous importance - December 27, 1647. On that day in his prison at Carisbrooke Castle, three Scottish Commissioners, the Lord Chancellor Loudoun and the Earls of Lanark and Lauderdale, made a secret treaty with Charles whereby they engaged to put a Scottish army at his disposal. Charles agreed that should he be restored, he would establish Presbyterianism in England for three years and suppress all sectaries including Independents. The Solemn League and Covenant - this shows how sorely he was pressed - he promised to give Parliamentary sanction but refused to make compulsory. His own household was to have freedom of worship. After the three years' trial /

trial of Presbyterianism he would establish permanently such a polity as the Westminster divines, with twenty commissioners of his nomination, should determine as most agreeable to the Word of God. Such was the famous treaty known as the "Engagement" described by Lauderdale as "most honest, though unhappy".³⁵ The Hamilton party, having made their premises, had now to endeavour to fulfil them. In March the Estates met at Edinburgh, the composition of the body being a tangible proof of the change of opinion that had come over the country regarding the Covenant. Out of a number of nobles rather exceeding fifty about ten were in favour of it, of the barons less than half, while almost all the Commissioners of the larger towns were against. The Engagement was anything but popular. The opposition of the ministers remained unaltered³⁶ while to Hamilton's chagrin, the Commission of the Kirk required "everie minister to keipe himselfe frie from giveing advice, assent, or countenance to this present Levie; as also, that no Presbyterie should send any of ther number along therewith."³⁷ Supplications against the levy poured into the Parliament.³⁸ Baillie, who first received the Engagement with joy, then grew suspicious and finally openly opposed it.³⁹ This, "the great and only question for the tyme",⁴⁰ he said, he hoped would not last "and so the ground of our difference with the state shall be removed."⁴¹

On 17th August, 1648 Hamilton's army was cut to pieces at Preston. Then followed such a reign of intolerance as had never been seen in Scotland - an intolerance which seemed to increase rather /

rather than decrease with the years. "It is judged," says Baillie's correspondent Spang, "a grither sin not to protest against the late Engadgment than to be a ordinary drunkard."^{42.} Delinquents were required to make public repentance in church,⁴³ and so, as Burnet says, "all churches were upon that full of mock penitents, some making their acknowledgments all in tears, to gain some credit with the new party."^{44.} Burnet's assertions are corroborated by Sir James Turner, one of those who had participated in the "hainous guiltines"^{45.} of the Engagement.

"The Ministers of the gospell ressavd all our repentances as unfained thogh they knew well enough they were bot counterfeit; and we on the other hand made no scruple to declare that Engadgment to be unlauffull and sinfull, deceitfullie speakeing against the dictates of our ounē consciences and judgments. If this was not to mocke the allknoweing and allseeing God to his face, then I declare myselfe not to know what a fearfull sinne hypocrisie is."^{46.}

Ministers were deposed for their "silence in the tyme of the leatte Engagement."^{47.} Offenders were ferreted out in a manner that can only be described as petty and mean.^{48.} Others were debarred from eligibility for the eldership.^{49.} Even refusals to allow participation in the Lord's Supper are recorded^{50.} - surely the high-water mark of seventeenth century intolerance. Lastly - dreadful punishment from the extreme covenanting point of view - some were refused renewal of the Solemn League and Covenant.^{51.} And so an engagement, begotten in hypocrisy,^{52.} was instrumental in making men hypocritical too.

There is little doubt that the very extravagances of the period after the Engagement strengthened the hands of those who sought /

sought a more peaceful course. It is now, for example, that we hear of Leighton's intention to resign from his charge at Newbattle. What are we to say, for instance, of his evident backsliding in covenanting zeal, his vacillating and shifty "carriage" in the Presbytery meetings, his excuses reasonably considered "somewhat weak" by his brethren?⁵³ Was he, like other eminent Scotsmen of the time, such as Lord Sinclair,⁵⁴ turning his back on the Covenanters - considering that the crusade against the King was being pushed farther than he cared to be associated with and still clinging to the forlorn hope that a compromise might be reached without proceeding to the last extremity of dethroning Charles? Perhaps the influences bringing about the transition were of an accumulative nature. We have already seen something of this, the violent proceedings of the Glasgow Assembly, the coercive nature of both Covenants, the National and the Solemn League, especially the latter, and now the Engagement with its harsh and cruel consequences. The soul of the minister of Newbattle was beginning to revolt against the ever increasing volume of intolerance, an intolerance, we have seen, that did not stop short at debarring "Engagement" offenders and malignants from the benefits of the Holy Communion.⁵⁵ Perhaps, too, he was regarding with suspicion the pretensions of the General Assembly. As far back as the time of the trouble over the Service Book the Marquis of Hamilton had informed the King of the new Covenanting tenet "that what the Generall Assemb(ly) concludes on in maters of religion, they ar obliged not onlie to belave bot to seconde /

seconde with ther best indeuores, houlding the infallabilitie of thatt assemb(ly)."⁵⁶ Dick, Baillie, Gillespie and Durham, Sir James Turner informs us, had preached the Covenanters to a perfect disobedience of all civil power "except such as was authorised by the Generall Assemblie and Commission of the Kirk."⁵⁷ "What was the tyranny of bishops and the new Service Book", says Wishart, "to the inquisitions of the General Assembly? The little finger of kirk-sessions had proved thicker than the King's loins."⁵⁸

Moderate opinion, it was evident, was being alienated.

Could it be organized?

VI. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Chronicles of the Frasers. James Fraser. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. 285.
2. Memoirs of James, Marquis of Montrose. 1639-1650. Rev. George Wishart, D.D. Translated by A.D. Murdoch and H.F.M. Simpson. Preface p. xxxvii.
3. Scot. Hist. Review. Vol. 14, 1917. p. 356.
4. D.N.B. Vol. XXII. Article "James Graham". (S.R. Gardiner). p. 317.
5. Buchan Field Club. Vol. VIII. 1904-5. p. 155.
6. Chronicles of the Frasers. James Fraser. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. 302.
7. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 262.
8. Chronicles of the Frasers. James Fraser. Scot. Hist. Socy. pp. 357 & 358.
9. H.M.C. 3rd Report. 1872. Lord Rollo's MSS. p. 407.
10. Monteith's History. p. 59.
11. Chronicles of the Frasers. p. 358.
12. e.g. Baillie. Vol. II. pp. 280 & 362.
13. Chronicles of the Frasers. p. 361. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 98.
14. Leighton's Works. Vol. IV. p. 495.
15. H.M.C. 2nd Report. 1871. Duke of Montrose's MSS. p. 175.
16. Do. p. 175.
17. Do. p. 175.
18. Baillie. Vol. II. p. 117.
19. Do. p. 185.
20. Do. p. 117.
21. Register of the Privy Council of Scotland. Edinburgh. 1877-1913. Vol. iii. p. 435.
22. Baillie. Vol. II. p. 216.
23. Do. pp. 253 & 254.
24. Protestant Thought before Kant. A.C. McGiffert. p. 107. p. 130 seq.
25. Wishart's Memoirs. pp. 201 & 202.
26. Baillie. Vol. II. p. 191.
27. Chronicles of the Frasers. p. 409.
28. Theology and Theologians of Scotland. Cunningham Lectures. James Walker. p. 17.
29. Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie. 1631-1654. Spalding Club. p. 219.
30. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 311.
31. Theological and Expository Lectures. Robert Leighton, D.D. Edited by Rev. C. Bradley. 1828. p. vii.
32. D.N.B. Vol. XXI. Article "Patrick Gillespie". (G.W. Sprott). p. 362.
33. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 287.
34. Baillie. Vol. II. pp. 260, 325, 326, 327, 328 & 343.

35. H.M.C. 4th Report. 1874. Wauchope of Niddrie MSS.
p. 538.
36. H.M.C. 11th Report. Part VI. 1887. p. 123.
37. Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club.
p. 121.
38. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. pp. 234-238.
39. Baillie. Vol. III. pp. 33, 34 & 47.
40. Do. p. 54.
41. Do. p. 65.
42. Do. p. 80.
43. cf. Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club.
pp. 122 & 123.
44. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 79.
45. Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbegie.
1631-1654. Spalding Club. p. 158.
46. Sir James Turner's Memoirs. p. 94.
47. Diary of Mr. John Lamont of Newton. 1649-1671. p. 10.
48. See e.g. the case of the Kirk Session of the Church of
St. Cuthbert, Edinburgh. Scot. Hist. Review.
Vol. 3. 1906.
49. H.M.C. 14th Report. Part III. 1894. Marchmont MSS.
p. 94.
50. Lamont's Diary. p. 39.
Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. p. 46.
cf. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 58.
51. Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. p. 46.
52. Sir James Turner's Memoirs. p. 51.
53. Extracts from the Presbytery Books of Dalkeith.
Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries.
Vol. IV. pp. 459-489.
54. Buchan Field Club. Vol. VIII. 1904-5. p. 151.
55. Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife.
1611-87. Abbotsford Club. p. 148.
56. Hamilton Papers. p. 50.
57. Memoirs of Sir James Turner. p. 53.
58. Wishart's Memoirs of James, Marquis of Montrose. p. 290.

VII.

CROMWELL. THE COMMONWEALTH and the PROTECTORATE.

We now enter the Cromwellian period. Again, however, we are solely interested in those events and opinions relative to our subject.

Charles was executed on February 5, 1649, the Scottish Estates proclaiming his son king only six days thereafter. Already the Act of Classes had been passed - a sore blow to any party of moderation. By it all who had shown themselves hostile to the Covenant or had taken any part in the Engagement or committed any such sin, were excluded from holding military or civil office till they had proved their faithful repentance. Such a purging and pruning ensued as left the ministry, parliament and magistracy the merest shadows of their former selves. "Now the ministry", says Kirkton, "was notably purified, the magistracy altered, the people strangely refined. It is true, at this time hardly the fifth part of the lords of Scotland were admitted to sit in parliament; but those who did sit were esteemed truly godly men." ¹ More moderate opinion, such as that of Baillie - and Leighton - was astounded and alarmed. The former expressed his fear that it would cause further divisions, ² that it was "so severe, that it will be needfull to dispense with some part of it for the peace of the countrey." ³

Some were sanguine of results in the negotiations with Charles at the Hague. "I am very confident", wrote

Sir /

Sir Alexander Home from the Hague in March 1649 to Sir David Home of Wedderburn, "when the Commissioners come, if their proposalls be not very unreasonable, they will find the King apt to comply with them, having, to my knowledge, very good inclinations to our nation and great hopes that their service will be above all other earthly men usefull to him for recoverie of his right in England." ⁴ On the other hand, the Duke of Hamilton, who was present when the Commissioners arrived, was not so hopeful and could not advise Charles to "an absolute compliance with all the extremities of their demands." ⁵ True to his Stuart blood, Charles at first preferred exile to signature of such a Covenant, supporting his preference by the hopes he entertained from the intervention on his behalf of the Marquis of Ormond in Ireland and Montrose in Scotland. Accordingly, on June 11, 1649, the Commissioners arrived home "much unsatisfied", ⁶ to use Lamont's phrase. Both the Marquis of Ormond and Montrose, however, failed. Charles accordingly, seeing no alternative, signed. Plainly all was insincere. Says a letter from Paris dated May 1650 -

"In Scotland he will forbear the use of the common Prayers; and conform himself to the form of Divine worship there used. And some men are of the minde, he would do as much if he were at Rome, for all men knows what instructors he hath had for his religion, and which way his own inclinations tend; and that what he doth now is meerly for interest, and as soon as his interest shall change, which will be when he is close in the saddle upon the Argylians' back, and then we here are of opinion he will soon change his practice." ⁷

It is perhaps not inopportune at this point to look at the character /

character of the king with whom the authors of the accommodation movement were eventually to negotiate. His character was strangely diversified. He was not without a good understanding,⁸ and though Burnet says he was not studious,⁹ he had no small interest in art and letters,¹⁰ mathematics, chemistry and mechanics.¹¹ He was clement,¹² good-natured,¹³ moderate,¹⁴ and in general bearing such as to make even Baillie confess his admiration.¹⁵ Unfortunately, the other side of the picture was so obvious as to lead Wishart to declare that he had tenfold his father's faults, with none of his virtues.¹⁶ He was tyrannical,¹⁷ ungrateful,¹⁸ deceitful,¹⁹ credulous,²⁰ and selfish,²¹ and although Lord Fountainhall speaks of his firmness in religion,²² Burnet declares he seemed to have no religion²³ and some went the length of calling him "an idolator, an enemy to God's church."²⁴ Regarding his debauchery and general scandal of life there can be no reasonable doubt²⁵ though Sharp took it upon himself to defend him from such aspersions.²⁶ He had, however, a certain amount of energy and ability in dealing with business not to his liking, though he had no staying power for prolonged work.

Charles's days, however, in Scotland were meanwhile not to be for long, the battles of Dunbar and Worcester putting an end to his hopes. The ensuing intolerance served but to draw the more moderate school closer together. Already Leighton was entering into correspondence with Robert Burnet and others not unfavourable to Episcopacy who, like himself, were repelled by Presbyterian violence²⁷ - in particular by the unseemly wranglings of Protesters and /

and Resolutioners. As usual Leighton favoured the more liberal and less fanatical party - in this case, the Resolutioners. Sharp at a later date spoke of them as "loyall calm moderat in reference to the king & civill power"²⁸ and this was true of them in the present time. Sharp himself, needless to say, was a Resolutioner but despite his pious expressions, the blame for the wound remaining a gaping one lies largely at his door.²⁹ Indeed, Leighton's predilections can partly be accounted for by the fact that in the ranks of the Resolutioners were many whose sympathies were for Episcopacy.³⁰ This party, moreover, was not so rigid in regard to the Covenants, which they regarded as "legal and governmental documents" with themselves as "referees under the deeds", while the Anti-Resolutioners looked on them as "symbolistic documents" and themselves as "directors of souls." For the former the Solemn League and Covenant was allowed to fall into the background "only to be produced as a weapon of defence against the Sectaries" whereas to the latter it was a "bond of union between the Elect."³¹ The Protesters, though inferior in numbers, were the greater favourites with the people who delighted in their extravagances. Baillie's picture is peculiarly graphic.

"They are most bitter against those who adhere to their Covenant in the matter of the King and Assemblies: they are also bent as ever to purge the Church: to punish men truly deserveing censure, we are also willing as they; but their purging is for common a very injurious oppression."

"They were instructed to have monethly fasts and communions as they could have them: at their communions they excluded more than the halfe of those who were ordinarlie admitted: . . . at their fasts, four or five ministers of their best preachers in the bounds exercised from morning to even."³²

Well-meant attempts at union of Resolutioners and Protesters were made by such men as Blair and Durham but the frustrating tactics of Guthrie and Warriston made them of no avail.³³ Baillie bewailed the failure. "The miserable daylie fruits of our division," he said, "are hardly tollerable."³⁴ No less perturbed over the condition of the church was the minister of Newbattle. One of the "foresigns of further judgments" he pointed out to his congregation was - "The Lord taking away His eminent and worthy servants, who are as the very pillars of the public peace and welfare, (i.e. those taken prisoners at Worcester) and taking away counsel and courage and union from the rest; forsaking us in our meetings, and leaving us in the dark to grope and rush one upon another." The second he mentioned bore reference to the weary contentions of Protester and Resolutioner - "The dissensions and jarrings in the State and Church are likely, from imagination, to bring it to a reality. These unnatural burnings threaten new fires of public judgments to be kindled amongst us."³⁵

From 1651 to 1660 Scotland was under the Commonwealth and Protectorate and during that period and for the first time in its history it was a completely conquered and subjected country. Religiously there was no small advance. That the gospel was preached - and successfully - is vouched for by considerable contemporary evidence. "The labours of the clergy", writes Orichton in his memoirs of John Blackadder, a noted Covenanter soon to make a name for himself, "during the Interregnum, wrought a salutary and universal reform on the public morals."³⁶ Law too, /

too, in his "Memorialls", not only corroborated this testimony to the success of the gospel but also assigned the reason for it.

"It is not to be forgotten that, from the year 1652, to the year 1660 there was great good done by the preaching of the gospell in the west of Scotland, more than was observed to have been for 20 or thirty yeirs before; a great many brought in to Christ Jesus by a saving work of conversion, which was occasioned through ministers preaching nothing all that tyme but the gospell, and had left off to preach up parliaments, armies, leagues, resolutions, and remonstrances, which was much in use before, from the year 1638 till that time 52." ^{37.}

Liberty of worship for the whole people was also carefully attended to by Commissioners and was eminently successful in practice. Perhaps, however, there has been an over laudation of Cromwellian toleration, for, it must be remembered, it was essentially limited, embracing only varieties of Puritanism. ^{38.} Roman Catholics and Episcopalians were definitely excluded. ^{39.} Nevertheless, Cromwell's measures were in themselves a great advance. We can see even in Kirk Session documents that there were not wanting those who welcomed the new era that was dawning. For example, we read in the Kirk Session Records of Aberdeen of a man cited to appear before that court to give an account of his religious profession who refused to recognise the judicatory unless authorized by the Commonwealth. "All the wholl tyme", runs the minute, "he carried himself uncivillie and upbraidinglie, thanking God that the tymes wer not as formerlie." ^{40.} Even Baillie, to whom toleration was anathema, appears to have been not altogether unthankful that the times were changed. ^{41.} Gradually through the influence of the English a more tolerant spirit appeared /

appeared even among the Covenanters themselves.⁴² This boded well for the future.

To the Presbyterians a cause of grave disquietude was the growth of the number of sects - an inevitable result of the toleration which, being something new in Scotland, brought forth a bewildering array of parties. "Levellers", "Famelists", "Brownists", "Millinaries", "Arminians", "Seekers", "Ranters", "Enthusiasts", "Arrians", "Pelagians", "Quakers", "Anabaptists" cum multis aliis, chronicles Fraser.⁴³ "Puritanes", "Babarteres", "Auld-hornes", "New-hornes", "Croce Pet(it)ioneris", "Separistes" adds Nicoll.⁴⁴ Baillie, too, speaks of most of these and especially of "Antinomians" and "Socinians" who, it appears from the frequency of mention in his pages, particularly interested him.⁴⁵ From Presbytery Records we can see the "brethren" had a busy time especially with the Anabaptists and the Quakers.⁴⁶

Such sectarianism led many to the study of the primitive church. For example, Burnet touches on the two primary reasons for the change soon to be brought about in Leighton's life viz:- the concentration of his thoughts on "the purity and simplicity of the primitive ages" and "the unquiet and meddling tempers" not only of the Independents, to whom the context primarily refers, but also of the Covenanters.⁴⁷ How could he be anything but tired of a church whose General Assembly excommunicated a man "for having conversed with the Marquis of Montrose" on his landing in 1650,⁴⁸ which debarred "Malignants" even from the Holy Communion,⁴⁹ which expelled from the presence of Charles II his uncovenanted /

uncovenanted chaplains,⁵⁰ which made even the moderate Baillie commend his correspondent Spang for having refused his pulpit to the saintly Dr. Forbes of Corse,⁵¹ which agreed with the belief of its English representatives that "to let men serve God according to the persuasion of their own consciences is to cast out one devil that seven worse might enter",⁵² and whose ministers were "readie to goe alongst with ane army, and venture their persons" against the sectaries of England? How could he but feel the sting of the jibe that the Commissions of the General Assemblies had acted as exorbitantly as the highest prelates⁵³ and that the tyranny of Presbytery was equal to the Spanish Inquisition?⁵⁴ Such intolerance was now bearing its fruit and so his thoughts turned to the "purity and simplicity of the primitive ages." "Mr. Lightoun", says Baillie in 1658, "does nought to count of, but looks about him in his chamber."⁵⁵ But it was for an escape from the narrowness of his surroundings that he was looking - and this came with the Restoration of King Charles II.

VII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Kirkton's History. p. 48.
2. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 139.
3. Do. p. 92.
4. H.M.C. Home of Wedderburn MSS. 1902. p. 99.
5. Carte. Original Letters. i, 243.
6. Lamont's Diary. p. 2.
7. Letters and Papers illustrating the relations between Charles II. and Scotland in 1650. S.R. Gardiner. Scot. Hist. Socy. pp. 104 & 105.
8. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 168-170.
9. Burnet. Vol. II. p. 480.
10. Scot. Hist. Review. Vol. III. 1906. See Article by W.G. Blaikie-Murdoch.
11. Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 till 1701, being chiefly taken from the Diary of Lord Fountainhall. p. 46.
12. Do.
13. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 435.
14. D.N.B. Article "Charles II". (A.W. Ward). Vol. X. p. 104.
15. Lauderdale Papers. Edited Osmund Airy. Camden Society. Vol. II. p. 194.
16. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 442.
17. Baillie. Vol. III. pp. 87, 88, 89 & 442.
18. Wishart's Memoirs of James, Marquis of Montrose. p. 290.
19. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 169.
20. Burnet. Vol. II. p. 479.
21. D.N.B. Vol. IV. Article "Robert Douglas". (A.C. Bickley). p. 347.
22. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 168.
23. Defoe's Memoirs of the Church of Scotland. Part III. p. 224.
24. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 458.
25. D.N.B. Vol. X. Article "Charles II". (A.W. Ward). p. 104.
26. Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, First Earl of Ancrum and his son William, Third Earl of Lothian. Vol. II. p. 497.
27. Chronological Notes of Scottish Affairs from 1680 till 1701, being chiefly taken from the Diary of Lord Fountainhall. p. 46.
28. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 168.
29. Letters and Papers illustrating the relations between Charles II. and Scotland in 1650. S.R. Gardiner. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. 78.
30. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 170, 285 & 316. Vol. II. p. 481.
31. Memorials and Letters illustrative of the Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee. Mark Napier. Vol. I. p. 203.

27. Grub's Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Vol. III.
p. 194.
Secretan's Troubled Times and Holy Life of Archbishop
Leighton. p. 47.
28. Lauderdale Papers. Edited Osmond Airy. Camden Society.
Vol. I. p. 57.
29. Hodrow. Vol. I. p. 61.
30. D.H.B. Vol. LI. Article "James Sharp". (T.F. Henderson).
p. 405.
31. Scot. Hist. Review. Vol. VII. 1910. p. 81.
32. Baillie. Vol. III. pp. 244-8.
33. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 185.
34. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 180.
35. Leighton's Works. Vol. IV. p. 692.
36. Memoirs of Rev. John Blackadder by Andrew Orichton. p. 53.
cf. pp. 41 & 54.
37. Memorialis; or The memorable things that fell out within
this island of Brittain from 1638 to 1684 by the
Rev. Robert Law. Edited O.K. Sharpe. p. 7.
38. cf. A.C. McGiffert. Protestant Thought before Kant.
p. 137.
39. Carlyle. Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell. Vol. II.
p. 175.
40. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery
and Synod of Aberdeen. 1562-1681. Spalding Club.
Preface pp. xi-xli.
41. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 253.
42. Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall.
1643-1688. Edited W. Mackay. Scot. Hist. Socy.
p. ix.
43. Chronicles of the Frasers. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. 405.
44. Nicoll's Diary. pp. 38 & 39.
45. e.g. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 340.
46. Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife. 1611-87.
Abbotsford Club. p. 176.
Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark.
1623-1709. Abbotsford Club. p. 101.
47. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 247 & 248.
48. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Vol. I. 1893.
p. 275 note.
49. Lamont's Diary. pp. 15 & 39.
50. Hamilton Papers. p. 240.
51. Baillie. Vol. II. p. 166.
52. Stoughton. Church of the Civil Wars. p. 444.
53. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 88.
54. Baillie. Vol. II. p. 137.
55. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 365.

VIII.

THE RESTORATION.

The date of Cromwell's death was the 3rd of September 1658 and on the 29th of May 1660, when Charles II entered London in triumph, came the Restoration. No party in the State was more delighted with and expected greater benefits from that "miraculous" event than the ministers. "The joy and rejoycing of my heart upon the account of his royall Majesties returne and reestablishment", wrote Andrew Auchinleck, minister of Dundee, to the Earl of Lauderdale, "is such as I cannot expresse"² and with him agreed the great majority of his brethren,³ including Baillie⁴ and Sharp.⁵ Presbytery Records, too, those invaluable sources for contemporary thought, bear the same testimony.⁶

Into the political aspects we need not enter. Assuredly the character of the new ministers of state boded little good - the Earl of Glencairn as Chancellor, the Earl of Rothes as President,⁷ the Earl of Lauderdale as Secretary.⁸ A time of shameless duplicity and double-dealing followed. On the last day of August Sharp arrived from London with a letter from the King - *verbo principis*⁹ - to the Presbytery of Edinburgh. On the 3rd of September this judicatory met and the letter was read. "We do also resolve to protect and preserve the government of the Church of Scotland", said Charles, "as it is settled by law, without violation". Naturally the joy of the ministers was unbounded. They purchased a silver box in which they enshrined the precious document. /

document. All over the country was rejoicing.¹⁰ It was soon to be discovered - after the passing of the Act Rescissory - that by "the government of the Church of Scotland as it is settled by law" was meant Episcopacy - the mean and shuffling trick of a King who had openly declared he had not the least thought of violating or infringing the Presbyterianism of Scotland.¹¹ Burnet is particularly severe on Sharp for his part in the transaction, for his engineering of a letter "to lay the presbyterians asleep" while planning the introduction of Episcopacy.¹² Nothing can palliate a trickery into which even the Earl of Middleton showed hesitation to enter,¹³ for the plain meaning of the letter was that Presbyterianism was to be continued.¹⁴ Such conduct was not likely to be efficacious in winning Scotland to the new polity. Nor were such methods likely to help the moderate school who sought an accommodation. The whole affair was so cunningly managed¹⁵ that even Sharp expressed his alarm. Not only, he says, did the Act nullify the civil sanction of the Covenants but also made void any security they had by law for religious government. "We were promised & expected moderation, but what shall be expected when such acts pass; our Scots humor is ever upon extreams, and if the church government did depend upon the vote of this parliament it would undoubtedly be overturned."¹⁶ Meanwhile he assured his brethren that there was no design to alter the church government,¹⁷ though he knew full well that this was anything but true. Presbyterianism, in effect, had ceased to be the polity of the church but Baillie - now drawing near the end of his earthly pilgrimage - was /

was not deceived by the ruse -

"Is it wisdom to bring bak upon us the Canterburian tymes, the sam desings, the same practises; will they not bring on at last the same horribill effects what ever fools doe ames . . . if you have gone with your hert to forsak your Covenant, to countenanc the Reintroduction of bishops & books & strenthening the King by your advyse in thes things, I think you a prime transgressor and liable among the first to answer to God for that grit sin." ¹⁸

So he wrote to Lauderdale.

But the appeal was to Stuart absolutism - a vain endeavour! What were the chances of a new ecclesiastical polity? What, in particular, were the chances of any moderate *via media*? Assuredly the religious question could no longer lie in abeyance and something had to be done for the settlement of the church government. Various motives contributed to the reestablishment of Episcopacy. Just as in the case of the Presbyterians whom we have already noted there were now Episcopalians who held the divine right of their polity. In England this had been the position of men like Adrian Saravia, Bilson, Bancroft, Andrewes, Thorndike and Hall. It was, too, the position of Sharp, who, however, could change his tune to suit new circumstances. ¹⁹ That many - like Sir John Cunningham - outside the ranks of ecclesiastics proper were of like opinion cannot fairly be denied. ²⁰ Leighton himself, we know, was quite conversant with the claim, ²¹ though he cannot be looked on as an exponent of a *de iure divino* Episcopacy. Indeed, in Scotland this point of view was never held with any great enthusiasm. The exercise of Archbishop, Bishop or Minister, said Lauderdale, "was not *Jure Divino*, but depended solely on the Supreme /

Supreme Magistrat." ^{22.} There can be no doubt of the existence of considerable indifference - many must have been like Bishop Burnet's father who, while of the opinion that episcopal government had its roots in the Apostles' times, declared he could easily live under another form. ^{23.} A further and more important consideration was that Episcopacy was well suited for monarchy. Kings had always been regarded with reverence by the Scots and more so now with the advent of Charles II. and the passing of the Commonwealth sufferings. It had, we have seen, been the plea of Charles I. ^{24.} It was now that of his son. ^{25.} Even in the sixteenth century men like Lord Maitland of Thirlestane and Lord Menmuir had seen the political advantage of Episcopacy as also had the Marquis of Hamilton in the time of Charles I. ^{26.} It was now the constant theme of Sharp who pointed with practical finger to its utility and to the fact that "since it was wanting . . . ther hath beine nothing bot trowbels and disturbances both in church and state" ^{27.} and that those who were known to be disaffected towards Episcopacy were justly suspected with being at enmity with the prerogative of the Crown. ^{28.}

Charles II. himself had no doubt in the matter, regarding Presbyterianism with an intensity of hate, ^{29.} though there is every ground to suspect Sharp's assertion that he held the divine right of Episcopacy. ^{30.} At any rate he made a show of ascertaining the will of the nation - a task which he entrusted to Middleton. ^{31.} The opinions of such of the Scottish counsellors as were in London were taken. Middleton at once declared that
the /

the larger and more intelligent portion of the community was in favour of Episcopacy and he counselled steps being taken immediately for its reintroduction.^{32.} According to Glencairn the insolencies of the Presbyterians had so dissatisfied all loyal subjects that six to one in Scotland longed for Episcopacy - a polity which hatched no rebellion as did Presbytery.^{33.} Glencairn, however, who is mentioned at this time as a man of moderate views,^{34.} only advocated a moderate Episcopacy.^{35.} Sharp, who was already betraying those who were trusting him,^{36.} gave it as his opinion that only the Protesters had to be reckoned with. The Earl of Rothes' computation was that four to one were in favour,^{37.} but he too could be an excellent dissembler.^{38.} Many who were generally sympathetic deprecated any hasty action and counselled slow and tactful procedure. Such were Sir Archibald Primrose,^{39.} the Earl of Kincardine,^{40.} and Lord Tweeddale, the last two of whom pressed the King to consult the Provincial Assemblies before taking action.^{41.}

On the other side the main influence was the Duke of Lauderdale who aforesaid had been a prominent Covenanter. The kingdom, he said, was very unmanageable in matters of religion but he proposed that they should consult either a General Assembly or Provincial Assemblies of each country (consisting of ministers and lay elders) or an Assembly of the ablest divines of each kingdom to meet at Westminster. It is probably true that he held no definite convictions and, as he confided to the King, his outlook was merely the utilitarian one that Charles I. had ruined himself in an attempt to enforce Episcopacy, and moreover that it was /

was now a primary consideration to keep Scotland friendly for use against England.⁴² Middleton rightly argued that all of Lauderdale's alternatives would mean the establishment of Presbyterianism and so they found little acceptance though Crawford came forward as a champion of Provincial Assemblies and the giver of the lie direct to Glencairn by his assertion that far from the latter's figures being correct, Presbyterians and Episcopalians were in the ratio of six to one.⁴³ The Duke of Hamilton, too, supported Lauderdale in his plea for delay and caution⁴⁴ but the influence of the Earl of Clarendon and the Duke of Ormonde together with that of Sharp was sufficient to prevail with the King.

The evidence, it must be confessed, is somewhat conflicting, the question naturally arising as to what extent the reintroduction of Episcopacy was possible and how far the soil was congenial. A picture of Scotland wholly and enthusiastically Presbyterian, it cannot be gainsaid, is quite erroneous for it does not accord with the contemporary evidence. On the contrary, there is much to show that there was considerable weariness of the Presbyterian yoke - indeed even as far back as 1650 we can read of this complaint.⁴⁵ Sir Edward Nicholas, writing to the Earl of Winchilsea on December 5, 1661, speaks of the nation being "wearied out with the imperious insolences of the Presbytery"⁴⁶ while so important a personage as Douglas, communicating with Sharp, testified to the same truth. "The generality of this new upstart generation", he wrote, "have no love to Presbyterial government, but are wearied /

wearied of that yoke, feeding themselves with the fancy of Episcopacy or moderate Episcopacy." ⁴⁷ The Duke of Hamilton, too, according to Sir James Turner, spoke to the like effect. ⁴⁸

Apart altogether, however, from the accumulating dislike of Presbyterians themselves there must have been a considerable number of Episcopalians in the country. If Jupiter Carlyle could declare that more than two-thirds of the country and most of the gentry were Episcopal in 1689 there must have been a good nucleus at the Restoration. The same deduction must be made from the statement of General Mackay in 1690 that he could form a greater Episcopal than a Presbyterian party in the country. William of Orange declared that while in Holland he was under the impression that Scotland generally was Presbyterian but that when he came to Britain he found that the great body of the nobility and gentry in Scotland were for Episcopacy and only the "trading and inferior sort" for Presbytery. ⁴⁹ Sir Archibald Primrose, writing in September 1661, of the King's proclamations regarding the church government, says of them they "are going throw the countrie, and, for anything that is knowne heere, hath mett with kyndlie reception at the publication in the borrowis quher it is yit come." ⁵⁰ There was, moreover, the powerful support of the nobility. Sharp speaks of the "temper of the most of the nobility, gentry & burrowes" as in favour of the change and of the "grandees" that "they are not those men who are influenced by ministers, or will be hindered or furthered in ther purposes by what ministers offer to them." ⁵¹ Archbishop

Burnet at a later date also spoke to the same effect.⁵² Baillie himself bewails what he considers to be the apostacy of the nation. "Our state is very averse to hear of our League and Covenant" he said. "Many of our people are hankering after Bishops, having forgot the evill they have done, and the nature of their office."⁵³ When we remember how bishops were treated in Scotland it is certainly strange yet significant to read in Fraser how they now appeared openly in the streets "crowded with affectionat salutations, and accosted for benedictions, such a veneration ther people have for that holy order, now so long ecclipsed."⁵⁴ Indeed, among the nobility and people in general, as among the ministers not only of the north,⁵⁵ where the episcopal interest was strong, but also of the south did such episcopal leanings exist - witness the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr,⁵⁶ and the Synod of Lothian.⁵⁷ Such evidence as has been adduced is impressive and is sufficient to dispel the picture of an all-Presbyterian Scotland. It also proves that to some extent at least the soil was congenial for accommodation projects yet perhaps there is a temptation to make too much of such evidence, that on the other side being equally impressive. Even Sharp saw that circumstances were not too propitious for the change. To abandon Presbyterianism, he wrote in December 1660, would be highly prejudicial to the Royal interest.⁵⁸ The common people, among whom the belief prevailed that Presbytery was rooted in infallible scripture proof,⁵⁹ were widely distrustful of, and indeed hostile to, Episcopacy. Sir Walter Scott's picture, it may be admitted, of Mause Headrigg is no exaggeration /

exaggeration⁶⁰ and in the west especially feeling always ran high.⁶¹ It was soon to be seen that the Presbyterians were ready to die for their convictions. When Rothes wrote, in reference to the persecuted Covenanters, of the "apparent inclinations in the generality of the people to shelter these villains from us"⁶² and Bishop Burnet wondered that no one would betray the murderer of Sharp,⁶³ they both paid a tribute to Scottish Presbyterianism. According to the reiterated opinion of Defoe the people of Scotland, when left to their own free will, were always staunchly Presbyterian.⁶⁴ Certain it is that so soon as it was known that Episcopacy was to be introduced protests were everywhere audible.⁶⁵ For the common people scholastic debates on the equation of the episcopate and presbyterate were of little interest but such popular arguments as that under the former godliness withered, bishops were cursed in person and family, and kindredship with popery was proved, had a great vogue.⁶⁶ The ministers themselves, it is apparent, were rigidly loyal to their polity⁶⁷ - so much so, indeed, that Hedrow takes it upon him to deny any sympathy whatever with moderate Episcopacy.⁶⁸ In the circumstances, accordingly, there is little wonder that Kincaid proposed to inform the King of the true temper of the nation.⁶⁹ From contemporary sources however, we can see there was - as now - among great numbers of good and pious people considerable indifference. These folks, if rightly handled, might have been utilised fittingly for the introduction of an Episcopacy moderate in type.⁷⁰ That there was such a body of men, small indeed, but influential, as was ready /

ready to accept and work for such a compromise cannot be gainsaid. In the north, needless to say, where, even after the advent of William and Mary, Episcopacy found considerable sympathy, there were many such men.⁷¹ In other parts of the country, too, it was not entirely absent. Archbishop Burnet, writing at a later date to Sheldon, said that the ejected ministers were not against bishops but allowed episcopal praesides who should preside in their meetings but have no more power than they.⁷² Indeed, that there was much talk on the possibility of constant moderators is vouched for by the testimony of Sharp,⁷³ who also affirmed that the ministers were more ready to yield in church matters to the King than before to any of his royal ancestors.⁷⁴ He declared himself sympathetic. "Nullum habeo argumentum theologium", he said, "against a constant well qualified presidency"⁷⁵ but he showed little sign of this when Leighton came forward with his comprehension scheme. In June 1660 he mentioned with commendation that the Presbyterians were willing to accept a modified Episcopacy after Ussher's model and later he counselled the "seber" in Scotland to do likewise.⁷⁶ As early as February of 1659 Monk had expressed himself in favour of "moderate Presbytery", thus showing his sympathy with a via media⁷⁷ - which was also the wish of Bishop Burnet's father, Robert Burnet. Baillie seems to have wavered on the question but plainly he did not regard all Episcopacy as unlawful⁷⁸ - one of the reasons why he was not returned a member to the Assembly at Edinburgh in August 1639 was that his opinions were considered somewhat lax! At times, at any rate, he could speak in favour of moderate Episcopacy, /

Episcopacy, though his inconsistency can be seen in passages where he is as vehement against. The Earl of Kincardin and Sir Robert Murray were potent personalities on the moderate side. Subsequent events assuredly would have been very different had their example and advice been followed. "I think a well ordered episcopacy", wrote the former, "the best of governments & I judge my self bound in conscience to defend episcopacie with my lyfe & fortune."⁷⁹ This advice, however, was not taken. Violent counsels won the day and as we shall see, the great opportunity of combining the Presbyterianism and Episcopacy of Scotland was allowed to pass.

VIII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Miscellany of the Maitland Club. Vol. IV. Part I.
Hamilton Papers. p. 181.
2. Laing MSS. I. 1914. p. 312.
3. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 115.
4. Baillie. Vol. III. pp. 405 & 442.
5. Lauderdale Papers. Edited Osmond Airy. Camden Society.
Vol. I. p. 27.
6. Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club.
p. 184.
7. Burnet's History. Vol. I. p. 188.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 219, 235, 236, 254,
263 & 264. Also Vol. II. p. 36.
8. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 401.
Law's Memorialis. p. 65.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 186.
Pepys' Diary under date March 2, 1664.
H.M.C. XIII. Part 2. 1893. p. 37.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 4.
Gardiner. Vol. III. p. 417.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 187.
Napier's Life and Times of John Graham of Claverhouse.
Vol. I. p. 228.
Miscellany of the Maitland Club. Vol. IV. Part I.
1847. Hamilton Papers. p. 175.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 447 note.
Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 156.
Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 183.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 197.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 41.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 187.
Miscellany of the Maitland Club. Vol. IV. Part I.
1847. Hamilton Papers. p. 179.
9. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 16.
10. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 410.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. Appendix B. p. LXXI.
Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club.
p. 185.
11. Letters and Papers illustrating the Relations between
Charles II. and Scotland in 1650. Edited S.R. Gardiner.
Scot. Hist. Socy. p. 58.
12. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 129.
13. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 82.
14. See Presbytery of Cupar. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 123.
15. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 112.
16. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 72.
17. Do. p. 66.

18. Lauderdale Papers. p. 95. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 459.
19. H.M.C. 2nd Report. 1871. MSS. of Trinity College,
Glenalmond. p. 203.
Lamont's Diary. p. 155.
20. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 436.
21. Transactions of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society.
Vol. I. 1886-9. Part IV. p. 59.
22. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 172.
23. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Edinburgh.
1904. Vol. II. p. 326.
24. H.M.C. 9th Report. 1883-4. Traquair MSS. 250 Part II.
H.M.C. 11th Report. 1887. Part VI. (1887). p. 97.
25. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. pp. 57 & 58.
26. Hamilton Papers. p. 40.
27. Lamont's Diary. p. 146.
28. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. xxxviii/ix.
29. D.N.B. Vol. X. Article "Charles II". (A.W. Ward).
p. 103.
Nicoll's Diary. p. 67.
Letters and Papers illustrating the Relations between
Charles II. and Scotland in 1650. Edited S.R. Gardiner.
Scot. Hist. Socy. p. 74.
30. H.M.C. 2nd Report. 1871. MSS. of Trinity College,
Glenalmond. p. 203.
31. D.N.B. Vol. XXXVII. Article "John Middleton".
(G.W. Sprott). p. 354.
32. Kirkton's History. p. 97.
33. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 53.
34. Baillie. Vol. III. pp. 35 & 37.
35. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 224.
Kirkton's History. p. 133.
36. Transactions of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.
Vol. II. pp. 104-6.
37. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 91.
38. Lamont's Diary. p. 134.
39. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 103.
Kirkton's History. p. 97.
40. D.N.B. Vol. VII. Article "Alexander Bruce".
(Osmund Airy). p. 88.
41. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 59.
cf. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 238.
42. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 197.
43. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 55.
44. D.N.B. Vol. XV. Article "William Douglas".
(Alsager Vian). p. 370.
45. Letters and Papers illustrating the Relations between
Charles II. and Scotland in 1650. Edited S.R. Gardiner.
Scot. Hist. Socy. p. 26.
46. H.M.C. Finch MSS. I. 1913. p. 173.
47. Quoted in A. Mitchell's Short History of the Church in
Scotland. p. 83.
48. Sir James Turner's Memoirs. p. 261.

49. H.M.C. 2nd Report. 1871. MSS. of Trinity College,
Glenalmond. p. 203.
50. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. p. 324.
51. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 88 & 89.
52. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. lviii.
53. Baillie. Vol. III. p. 448.
54. Chronicles of the Frasers. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. 426.
55. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 215.
Kirkton's History. p. 343.
Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 129.
56. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 117.
Kirkton's History. p. 120.
57. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 128.
58. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 44. See also
pp. 47, 48 & 50.
59. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 323.
cf. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 88 & 89.
60. Old Mortality. Ch. VII. et passim.
61. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 90.
See also Narrative of Mr. Nimmo. Scot. Hist. Socy.
pp. xii/xiii.
Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 172. p. 223.
H.M.C. Leyborne-Popham MSS. 1899. pp. 189 & 190.
Sir James Turner's Memoirs. p. 142.
62. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 256.
63. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 509.
64. Defoe's Memoirs of the Church of Scotland. Part III.
p. 327. Part II. p. 162.
65. Lamont's Diary. p. 135.
Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 252.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 294 & 295.
66. Kirkton's History. p. 129.
67. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 113 seq. pp. 116, 118-120.
68. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 214 seq.
69. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 238.
70. See e.g. Narrative of Mr. Nimmo. Scot. Hist. Socy.
pp. x, 67.
71. Buchan Field Club. 1887-1890. Vol. I. p. 95.
72. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 259 note.
73. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 74 & 78.
74. Do. p. 49.
75. Do. pp. 88 & 89.
76. See The Covenanters by J.K. Hewison. Vol. II. pp. 65 & 66.
77. H.M.C. Ormonde MSS. N.S. I. 1902. p. 333.
78. Gordon's History. Vol. II. p. 107.
79. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 229 & 230.

IX.

ACCOMMODATION PROSPECTS.

At first, the environment, it must be confessed, appeared to be far from congenial - a fact shown when, on September 5, 1661, the Lord Chancellor presented to the Scottish Privy Council a letter from Charles relating to ecclesiastical affairs. Said he, after making reference to his letter to the Presbytery of Edinburgh and the Act Rescissory -

"We have, after mature deliberation, declared to those of your Council here our firm resolution to interpose our royal authority for restoring of that Church to its right government by bishops, as it was by law before the late troubles, during the reigns of our royal father and grandfather, of blessed memory, and as it now stands settled by law."

If the Presbytery of Edinburgh had already been befooled and all Scotland with them they could see plainly now how they had been deluded. In accordance with the royal letter the Privy Council framed an Act, which was proclaimed at the market-cross amid the flourish of trumpets - whose very sound, be it said, was to usher in a pitiless period of blood and persecution.

It had been decided to introduce bishops but of those of the First Scottish Episcopacy only one, Sydserf, now an old man, remained. It was therefore imperative to find new ones, and to this end Sharp, Leighton, Fairfoul and Hamilton journeyed to London, that they might receive from their sister country that apostolical succession which had been lost and which they might henceforth be the means of restoring. Of Sharp and Leighton whose /

whose general character we know, nothing need be added. Fairfoul was a Presbyterian who, according to Wodrow, was a man of some learning and neat expression, but never taken to be either serious or sincere.² Burnet's picture of him is that of a pleasant and facetious man, insinuating and crafty, a better physician than a divine. Like Leighton he had sworn the Covenant and had persuaded others to do likewise.³ Hamilton, brother to Lord Belhaven, was, says Wodrow, very ordinarily endowed with gifts and was remarkable for his cunning timeserving temper.⁴ He was, furthermore, vouches Burnet, a good natured man but weak.⁵ On the whole Leighton cannot have been impressed by his companions. Fairfoul and Hamilton had been ordained under the old Episcopate and so their orders were considered valid but it was different with Sharp and Leighton who had been ordained since the reintroduction of Presbyterianism in 1638. The Bishop of London insisted on their first being made deacons and priests before they could be consecrated as bishops - a demand which raised the ire of Sharp, though Leighton, with laxer views, for whom such re-ordination was merely the ceremony of admission as a minister of the Episcopal Church, was supremely indifferent. Both, however, submitted. "I heard", notes Brodie on November 24, 1661, "Mr. Sharp and Leighton were re-ordained, and scrupled at nothing. It is a difficulti in thes tyme to know quherin true sound worship and godlines does consist: men readi to use the(ir) liberti for the hurt and destruction of others, and as a stumbling block to manie."⁶

On December 15, 1661, all four Sharp, Leighton, Fairfoul and Hamilton /

Hamilton were duly consecrated in Westminster Abbey. The consecration was acted, Nicoll the diarist records, with great solemnity, in presence of many of the nobility and clergy of England and many of the nobles of Scotland. "Eftir this consecration, these new bishops, with many peeres of England and Scotland, wer feasted in the new parochie yaird at Westminster." ⁷ Brodie expresses his horror of the ceremonies of which hearsay spoke, of the preacher who expatiated against Presbyterianism, mentioning Dunbar as a divine judgment.

"I heard that our Bishops bou'd to the alter, had on their surplices, rochetts, and other ceremonies, took the Sacrament kneeling at the alter quhen consecrated. I desired to consider and weigh thes things soberlie, and with understanding." ⁸

The feasting to which Nicoll refers and the general spirit of levity that followed the consecration shocked the gentle Leighton who, when he discovered that Sharp had no conciliatory plans for the introduction of Episcopacy in Scotland and that Fairfoul had no suggestions but jokes, began to lose all heart in the enterprise.

Leighton himself had two plans - one the offer of Ussher's reduction, the other, "to try how they could raise men to a truer and higher sense of piety, and bring the worship of that church (the Presbyterian) out of their extempore methods into more order; and so to prepare them for a more regular way of worship, which he thought was of much more importance than a form of government." ⁹ All, however, was in vain for Sharp had his own ideas of what a bishopric should be, ideas which were far from coinciding with those /

those of Leighton. While as yet the bishops were still in England, the Scottish Privy Council, acting on the King's instructions, published an order forbidding synods, presbyteries or kirk sessions till they received the authority of the archbishops and bishops,¹⁰ - an act which filled Scotland with alarm.¹¹

Parliament in its second session (May 8 - September 9, 1662) readmitted the bishops to its sittings and restored them to their "accustomed dignity, privileges and jurisdiction." (Acts of Parl. of Scot., VII, 370, 372). It was also enacted (June 11) that all persons holding their charges otherwise should, before the 20th of September, receive presentation from their lawful patrons and collation from their bishops or demit their cures. (ib. 376). Few, however, complied. The result was the Secret Council of Glasgow (October 1)¹² in which an Act was passed declaring all who had not complied with the law to have forfeited their livings, forbidding their preaching and charging them to remove with their families from their parishes before the 1st of November - mad act of a drunken Council,¹² for, as Sir George Mackenzie says, it "was blan'd by all wife and good men, as tending to irritate a country which was fond of its ministers."¹³ The day fixed by the Council arrived and, to the Commissioners' dismay, some three hundred and fifty ministers turned their backs upon their manse and refused to obey. Consternation fell on bishops and nobles alike while Sharp made haste to disown the deed.¹⁴

Thereafter the long arm of the law was directed against the absentees from the parish churches - an act "against separation and /

and disobedience to ecclesiastical authority", which imposed heavy fines and came to be known as the "Bishops' Drag-net" - an act so galling to the people, so Hodrow points out, as to make abortive all future attempts at accommodation.¹⁵ All that can be said is that the Act was fruitful in creating hypocrisy for, as Sir John Lauder said, "compelled prayers are not worth, force making but hypocrites, and the church like a prison house."¹⁶ Burnet speaks in the same strain¹⁷ while Leighton's own verdict, though referring to a later period, is equally applicable to this - "what pitifull poor things are wee", he writes, "if in our higher stations in y^e world and particularly in y^e church, wee proiect no higher end, then to drive poor people about us into a forc't compliance with our little wretched interests and humors."¹⁸

And yet, alarming as was the situation, there were certain, if not reassuring, at least palliative considerations. These it is important to note in our study of accommodation movements.

To begin with, the sphere of trouble was not merely so widespread as we are apt to imagine from reading chronicles written exclusively from a Presbyterian standpoint. Four-fifths of Scotland, it has been contended, was left untouched by the struggle¹⁹ and while about 200 ministers were extruded some 600 conformed without demur.²⁰ Again Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod Records are a valuable asset in proving that this was the case²¹ but we can see the truth of it from individual testimonies as well. Nicoll refers to numbers of the ministers making their submission to their Archbishops and Bishops²² while great numbers were quite indifferent /

indifferent as to what polity held the day.²³ Gavin Young, minister of Ruthwell, was the Scottish Vicar of Bray, he, between 1617 and 1671, holding his charge through all the ecclesiastical changes. "Wha wad quarrel wi' their brose", he said, "for a note in them?" and these views were not exclusively his own.²⁴ "I deny not", writes the Earl of Argyll as late as January 28, 1667, "I think there are too many that affect not the episcopall government, but I am confident a very inconsiderable number; and those inconsiderable persons, that incline to disturbe the peace"²⁵ while, according to Burnet, Middleton himself was quite taken aback "at this extraordinary submission of the presbyterians."²⁶ Accordingly, a Scotland ablaze from end to end with anti-episcopal ardour is a pure figment of the imagination. As far as numbers were concerned Leighton had a large majority upon his side, though it must be admitted that what the minority lacked in numbers it more than made good with activity and zeal. Had his colleagues been as reasonable as himself there is no reason why a moderate episcopacy should not have been eminently successful.

A further consideration to be kept in mind is, that however different to us Episcopacy and Presbyterianism may be, in Scottish Restoration times the difference was so attenuated as hardly to be noticeable either to the stranger or, for that matter of it, to the Scottish people themselves.

"To shew the unreasonableness of so much heat and rudeness in shutting episcopacy out of doors, when its temper in Scotland is such, that tho' in name and jurisdiction it is called episcopal, yet the way of its administration is so wide from episcopacy elsewhere, that /

that any stranger would take it for little else than Presbyterian, and an indifferent eye that sees the agreement in their worship and discipline, cannot but think it is a dispute about words."²⁷

So writes the Reverend Thomas Morer, minister of St. Ann's, Aldersgate, an impartial stranger who had the opportunity of examining Scotland and Scottish conditions. Nor can it be denied that an examination of the details serves but to prove his contention.

As before, there were in every parish consistorial or Kirk Sessions where the minister presided and with a number of competent laymen took cognisance of scandals etc. They met once a week and had a register which was kept by the precentor or parish clerk. A civil magistrate was present to enforce their acts.²⁸ Again, there were presbyteries, exercises or "precincts" as they were called, composed of the ministers of the several parishes within the bounds, one of whom, named by the bishop, acted as moderator.²⁹ Here they dealt with weightier matters, and even punished capital crimes. They had a sermon in the church where they met - such meetings being once a month.³⁰ There were, however, no elders,³¹ and, as Burnet points out, these courts had not quite their old standing.³² Further, there were Provincial Synods twice a year composed of a bishop and the several presbyteries within his jurisdiction. The president was the bishop who examined what was done in their ordinary meetings.³³ In theory the National Synod or General Assembly was the highest court of all, but, it must be confessed, it differed considerably from the corresponding Presbyterian court, for it was composed of Bishops, Deans, two members /

members from each presbytery (one of them to be the nominee of the Bishop) and one member from each University. It was to meet at such times and places as the King might appoint and was to consider such matters relating to the doctrine, worship, discipline and government of the church as should be submitted to it by the King's direction, through its president, the Archbishop of St. Andrews. Moreover, as it could only meet in the presence of the King or his Commissioner and its acts were to be invalid till approved by his majesty or his Commissioner, there were, as Burnet says, "great exceptions"³⁴ taken to the act remodelling its constitution. Particular resentment was felt against the giving of the negative vote not to the whole bench of bishops but to the president. Indeed, when people saw how the Synod was to be constituted no one desired to see it meet, which, as a matter of fact, it never did during the whole of the Second Episcopacy.³⁵ Accordingly, leaving aside this last judicatory as non-existent, there is much to be said for Morer's contention that while the government of the church was termed Episcopal it could hardly be discerned for such by travellers who had seen what Episcopacy was in other places.³⁶ Ecclesiastical records bear this out³⁷ and there can be little doubt that what Dr. Menzies Fergusson says of his own parish of Logie was true of the great majority of Scottish parishes during those years of fluctuations between Episcopacy and Presbytery - it "slumbered on, undisturbed by polemics."³⁸

In the matter of doctrine the old Confession which had been ratified at the beginning of the Reformation, had a certain amount of /

of authority but rather because it was sanctioned by the state than that it was enjoined by ecclesiastical law. But, as Matthias Symson, Canon of Lincoln, says in his "Present State of Scotland", "the bishops did not demand subscription to the old and first Confession of the Reformers, but connived at the Westminster Confession and Catechism".³⁹ Outside of the Scriptures and the Apostles' Creed there was practically no standard. In worship there was little or no difference. The liturgy was not used except in one or two places like the Chapel Royal at Holyrood and the parish church of Salton where Gilbert Burnet was minister. "We had no ceremonies", wrote Sir George Mackenzie, "surplice, altar, cross in baptism, nor the meanest of these things which would be allowed in England by the Dissenters in way of accommodation The way of worshipping in our church differed nothing from what the Presbyterians themselves practised, excepting only that we used the doxology, the Lord's Prayer, and, in baptism, the Creed."⁴⁰ There were few holy days and such as were observed were more "for the use of their fairs, and to know the age of the moon, or when the sun enters the signs than anything else."⁴¹ By virtue of the Act Rescissory the five Articles of Perth were reestablished but, as a matter of fact, they were hardly enforced at all. Private Communion for the sick was very rare and kneeling at the Communion, which was peculiarly obnoxious to the Presbyterians, was seldom practised. Indeed, during the Restoration period the Eucharist was hardly administered at all.⁴² Compulsory confirmation was entirely neglected and ordination was conferred by the bishops /

bishops with the assistance of their presbyters. Bishop Mitchell stood alone in insisting on reordination for ministers who had only Presbyterian orders. Indeed, this laxity was distasteful to many Episcopalians. "The government of the church was settled by law", wrote the Earl of Argyll to Lauderdale, "why should not the worship and discipline likewise?"⁴³ The Episcopal Church, it must be confessed, travelled as far along the road of compromise as was humanly possible in Restoration times. "So very careful was the Episcopal Church of Scotland not to give offence to the Presbyterian", concludes Morer, "that she became little more than Presbyterian herself to reconcile that party to her."⁴⁴ So too, thought Leighton himself. "There is in this Church no change at all", he writes, "neither in the Doctrine nor Worship, no, nor in the substance of the Discipline itself."⁴⁵

This then, was another ground upon which Leighton based his hope in the success of his proposed accommodation between two parties so different and yet, in many respects, so alike. How mistaken he was, we shall see later.

IX. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Wedrow. Vol. I. p. 230.
2. Do. p. 236.
3. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 241.
4. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 237.
5. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 241.
6. Brodie's Diary. pp. 228 & 229.
7. Nicoll's Diary. pp. 354 & 355.
8. Brodie's Diary. p. 233.
9. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 253.
10. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 63.
Kirkton's History. p. 138.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 254.
11. Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of
St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club.
pp. 77 & 78.
12. Kirkton's History. p. 149.
13. Mackenzie's Memoirs. pp. 77 & 78.
14. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 277.
15. Wodrow. Vol. I. pp. 350 & 352.
16. Sir John Lauder's Historical Observes. p. 87.
See also pp. 87 & 88.
17. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 436. Vol. II. p. 327.
18. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Vol. I.
p. 363.
19. Religion since the Reformation. Dr. Leighton Pullan.
20. Secretan's Troubled Times and Holy Life of Archbishop
Leighton. p. 65.
21. Hewison's Covenanters. Vol. II. p. 163.
See e.g. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session,
Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen. 1562-1681.
Spalding Club. p. lx.
Transactions of the Inverness Scientific Society and
Field Club. Vol. IV. 1888-1895. Parish Records
from Croy. 1640-1690. p. 359.
22. Nicoll's Diary. p. 374.
23. Law's Memorials. p. 101.
Chronicles of the Frasers. p. xiv.
24. Hewison's Covenanters. Vol. II. p. 128.
25. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. 1829. p. 56.
26. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 278.
27. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery
and Synod of Aberdeen. 1562-1681. Appendix.
p. lrv. Spalding Club.
28. Do. See also Grub's Ecclesiastical History of Scotland.
Vol. III. p. 217.
29. Selections from the Registers of the Presbytery of Lanark.
1623-1709. Abbotsford Club. p. 12.

30. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen. 1562-1681. Appendix. p. lxx. Spalding Club.
31. Kirkton's History. p. 217.
32. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 256.
33. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen. 1562-1681. Appendix. p. lxxvi. Spalding Club.
For the duties see Lamont's Diary. pp. 155, 156, 188, 193, 198, 204 & 209.
34. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 373.
35. Do.
36. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen. 1562-1681. Appendix. p. lxxvi. Spalding Club.
37. See e.g. Transactions of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. Vol. II. Edinburgh. 1822. Transcript from the Registers of the Presbytery of Parth. pp. 209, 210, 211 & 212.
Ecclesiastical Records. Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of St. Andrews and Cupar. 1641-1698. Abbotsford Club. p. 93.
Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall. 1643-1688. Edited by William Mackay. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. xiii.
38. Quoted in Scot. Hist. Review. Vol. 2. 1904-5. p. 452.
39. Present State of Scotland. Matthias Symson, Canon of Lincoln. pp. 241 & 242.
40. Sir George Mackenzie's Vindication of Charles II's Government. Works. II. p. 243.
41. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen. 1562-1681. Appendix. p. lxxvii. Spalding Club.
42. Do. p. lxxviii:
Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife. 1611-1687. Abbotsford Club. pp. 184 & 185.
Leighton's Works. Vol. VII. p. 196.
Records of the Presbyteries of Inverness and Dingwall. 1643-1688. Edited by William Mackay. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. xxi.
43. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. p. 353.
44. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery and Synod of Aberdeen. 1562-1681. Appendix. p. lxxvii. Spalding Club.
45. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII. p. 190.

X.

THE PERSECUTION.

Meanwhile the Privy Council was grappling with the problem of how to bring about uniformity. The method resolved upon was that of force. Accordingly, Sir James Turner, with a body of troopers, was despatched into the western and south-western counties where nonconformity was most rampant. Turner soon acted with such vigour, resolution and, may it be added, cruelty, as to win for himself an unenviable reputation, though he himself always asserted he never went the full length of his commission,¹ and certainly Sir Robert Moray quotes an opinion that he was a saint in comparison with Ballantyne.² Wodrow describes him as of a forward active temper with somewhat of harshness mixed with it, endued with a considerable stock of learning and very "bookish."³ He was, says Burnet, naturally fierce and mad when he was drunk, "and that was very often."⁴ Such a man was little likely to conciliate the Presbyterians, still less were the methods employed by the curates and bishops. A roll of parishioners was often called after service, the curate delivering to the officer commanding in the district a list of the absentees. From wealthy proprietors the Privy Council exacted exorbitant fines while, in the case of the poorer tenantry, the officer imposed a fine and, if it were not instantly paid, quartered soldiers on the family till the equivalent - or more - was obtained. Some of the bishops - Burnet mentions Sharp as one /

one ⁵ - sunk so low as to keep paid informers who attended conventicles in disguise and reported when they had seen. For years henceforth there was such a pitiable tale of persecution, torture and oppression as was unparalleled in the history of Scotland. ⁶ It is indeed lamentable to read the counsel given by men in station and authority. "The outed ministers that medled in the late rebellion" (of 1666), wrote the Earl of Argyll, "I thinke deserve torture My humble opinion is, that all will not engadge to live peaceably should be put wher ther needs no troops to suppress them." ⁷ "Thir pipill", wrote Rothes, "will never be quaiett till thay be totallie ruined." ⁸ Bad as this is, however, it is even worse to find the bishops - Burnet being a prime offender - counselling the use of still greater force. ⁹ In a period of such unrelieved gloom it is pleasant to see Wodrow admitting that the Bishop of Dunblane was against persecution ¹⁰ and to find Burnet narrating that many of the clergy were offended at the violent policy that was being pursued. ¹¹ The arbitrary, vindictive and extortionate system of fining was calculated to make not only the civil government but also those bishops who aided and abetted it odious in the eyes of the people ¹² especially when it became apparent that the money was finding its way into the pockets of greedy nobles who were out for their own aggrandisement - Rothes saying quite openly to Lauderdale that if the fines should be used for raising forces against the nonconformists (Sharp's proposal) many noblemen would be in dire straits. ¹³ So involved did Middleton himself become /

become¹⁴ that the matter could no longer be connived at and in 1663 Rothes took over his duties as Commissioner - a change which, as Nicoll says, only raised the people's suspicion still further.¹⁵ Violent as was the administration of Rothes it does not appear to have been violent enough for Sharp, as a letter of his to Archbishop Sheldon amply demonstrates.¹⁶ Archbishop Burnet, too, in his chagrin roundly accused the "great ones" as being "rotten at the heart",¹⁷ and Rothes hastened to reassure Lauderdale that the situation was not really so bad as many thought.¹⁸ On the 16th of January 1664 Sharp and Burnet were so far placated by the King setting up a Court of High Commission to attend to ecclesiastical affairs - a tyrannical court invested with plenary powers and embracing all within its jurisdiction. The primate himself was reputed to be the real author.¹⁹ Certainly it was instrumental in making himself and his fellow-bishops more unpopular than ever.²⁰ Gordon had criticised the High Commission of the First Episcopacy as a "mangrell clero or episcopo laicall ecclesiastico civill judicatorye"²¹ and certainly this one was as great a medley. Its proceedings were in a degree inquisitorial though, it must be admitted, the language of Defoe and Nedrow is highly coloured and exaggerated.²² The erection of the court was quite unnecessary and within little more than a year after its institution, Charles, seeing it was doing more harm than good, discontinued it. Its cessation, however, did not synchronise with a cessation of persecution. The staunch Presbyterians, deprived of all possibility of hearing their favourite ministers in /

in the parish churches, resorted to the expedient of forming conventicles in secluded places among the hills where there was little likelihood of molestation. With the passing of the years these grew in numbers and in daring, conflicts with the troops that were sent to hunt them down being not infrequent. Doubtless the origin of these conventicles may be found in the overcrowded home exercises of the ministers²³ but, as Kirkton says, the people had an affection for the fields above houses.²⁴ Through time these meetings assumed a great size - Sir George Mackenzie says that one or two by joining together could form an army of ten thousand men.²⁵ Archbishop Burnet speaks of thousands meeting at one time²⁶ and the Duke of Hamilton of as many as three thousand.²⁷ Altogether during the years of persecution, ending in the "Killing Times", some 18,000 people, it has been calculated, suffered for being implicated in conventicles.²⁸ The Scottish conventiclors, it appears, differed largely from their English brethren. They were more heady, says the Duke of Ormonde, more united in opinion, more ready to abandon their homes,²⁹ more apt to be inflamed than the English who, being largely of the trading class, did not so easily quit their homes. In Scotland, too, vouches Sir John Lauder, they openly professed their principles which, in England, were disseminated "clandestinely."³⁰ The conventiclors were composed of Resolutionsers and Remonstrators, the more moderate and extreme parties respectively,³¹ and were usually of humble station - "bot baygiers for the most part", wrote Rothes, "but tenants at best."³² Dr. George Hicke, Lauderdale's chaplain, asserted /

asserted that they were provoked and encouraged by the papists³³ - an assertion which seems to have been countenanced by Sharp himself³⁴ and has some colour lent to it on the authority of the Presbyterian Law.³⁵ Popery, however, was in the seventeenth century the usual accusation to use against an enemy. A more formidable charge was that conventicles were seminaries and "rendevouses" of rebellion.³⁶ This accusation was very common in the later or Cameronian period of the persecution. Claverhouse called the outed ministers "rebellious villans"³⁷ and Charles himself shared the belief.³⁸ Even the moderate Kincardine was alarmed at the "disaffected persons" who "preach dangerous doctrins." "I find discreet men", he says, "apprehensive it may turne to much mischeef if it be not prevented."³⁹ Persecution maketh a man mad and so in this period men held and taught the most extreme doctrines - Richard Cameron, Alexander Shields and John Brown all appealing to scripture texts (especially of the Old Testament) in justification of insurrection and assassination.⁴⁰ The charge, however, was also quite common in the earlier and less bitter period of the persecution. In 1664 the Dutch War broke out and the conventiclers were directly accused of helping the enemy. "If foren forsis or armis cum", wrote General Dalziel, "this laird vil all go in Rebellion"⁴¹ and Lauderdale also hastened to whisper the calumny in the ears of Charles.⁴² When peace came Major-General Drummond expressed the wish that the fury of the "phanatickes" might be assuaged, their hope being on "ferraine assistance".⁴³ In addition, too, they were accused of intriguing with /

with enemies in England⁴⁴ and Ireland.⁴⁵ Behind the simple folk who composed the "fanatics", it was more than once hinted, were men in position and authority who ever urged them to greater severities.⁴⁶ There was much, it would seem, to add colour to the arraignment, and evidence was adduced.⁴⁷ Even the moderate Sir Robert Moray admitted the sedition of the ministers.⁴⁸ Yet, just as in the earlier Covenanting period, when men like Argyll and Baillie denied all charges of disloyalty,⁴⁹ so now the denial was renewed.⁵⁰ If they rose in arms it was in defence of freedom and against Stuart despotism.⁵¹ Indeed, even if the charges were true there were strongly palliative considerations in the torture and persecution of those pitiless years. Contemporary letters and records are sufficient to show that the military excesses were such as to sting the conventiclers into reprisals.⁵² Even the Earl of Argyll expostulated to Lauderdale about the undue severity. "If I may say it without offence", he wrote, "the lesse the soldiery medle, except in securing the peace, the better."⁵³ Leighton himself, living in the comparative quiet of his diocese could brook the iron hand no longer. He was prevailed on, recounts Burnet, to go to court and give the King a true account of the proceedings in Scotland "which, he said, were so violent, that he could not concur in the planting of the Christian religion itself in such a manner, much less a form of government."⁵⁴ Accordingly, he asked leave to quit his bishopric, he considering himself accessory to the violence done by others. Charles listened with interest and, it would seem, with sympathy. He spoke adversely /

adversely of Sharp, promised that violent methods would cease but refused to hear anything of retiral from the bishopric.⁵⁵ On October 11, after the affairs of his Synod were ended, Leighton again referred to his projected retiral. His reasons, he told the brethren were - "the sense he had of his own unworthiness of so high a station in the church, and his weariness of the contentions of this church, which seemed to be rather growing than abating, and by their growth did make so great abatements of that Christian meekness and mutual charity, that is so much more worth than the whole sum of all that we contend about."⁵⁶ Leighton, however, was prevailed upon to stay, doubtless in the hope that a policy of conciliation might ensue. Indeed, in 1665 there was a lull in the persecution.⁵⁷ The authorities had the situation well in hand⁵⁸ and conformity was more or less successfully enforced.⁵⁹ Even in the Highlands there was comparative quiet.⁶⁰ The settlement of Episcopacy, wrote Rothes to Lauderdale (April 13, 1665) "is nou in so ffear a uay, I min by pipells resolving to submit, that a verie litill tays will randir both oposiers and uithdrauiers verie insignificant."⁶¹ The next year, however, witnessed a return to the reign of oppression and with it came, as Wodrow pointed out, a change in the character of the Presbyterian resistance - a change from passive to active resistance.⁶² This was the year of Gilbert Burnet's "Memorial of diverse grievances and abuses in this Church" and no more scathing indictment than this Episcopalian onslaught could be imagined - a schism forming, the power of religion lost, profanity daily growing, atheism /

atheism creeping in, the supineness and negligence of the clergy, non-residence and non-preaching prevalent, infrequency of communion and dissoluteness of the people, especially of the gentry and nobility. "What violent doings have we seen?", it says, "turning out hundreds of ministers, forcing scrupulous people to churches w^t oyr barbarous actions. These things you ought not to have driven on Your high places, brave horses, coaches, and titles savour but little of a mortified spirit."⁶³

According to Wodrow the feeling of the country was further embittered by Sharp who prevailed on the King to establish a standing army, thereby hoping that he would force the Presbyterians to extremities. "Then, under the colour of law, he would see his desire upon them."⁶⁴ Yet, despite the unsettled state of the country Rothes deliberately misrepresented the situation. There was no hazard he said, or any possibility of any stirring in the country to oppose the established laws of government of Church and State.⁶⁵ All the same, in October we find him threatening still greater force,⁶⁶ the consummation and fruit of the oppression coming on November 12, when, at Dalry in Galloway, a few men, maddened by a sight of gross cruelty overpowered the perpetrators and surprised Sir James Turner. Their numbers increasing, too, they marched by Lanark, Bathgate, Colinton and Pentland to Rullion Green. Here, on the 28th of November, they were defeated, forty-five being slain and a hundred captured. The Earl of Argyll said they were of the more extreme remonstrating party,⁶⁷ Ballantyne declaring he found them either "obdurate villains" or "simple misled /

misled poore people",^{68.} He also discovered, he asserted, "eminent persons" implicated.⁶⁹ According to Archbishop Sharp the "rebellion" was more general than was imagined.⁷⁰ Moray, however, refused to characterize the rising by such a term,^{71.} while the moderate Tweeddale vouched that the grinding oppression was the whole cause of the trouble.^{72.} Outside the ranks of those who took part in the insurrection were many who sympathised with the stand they made,^{73.} there being no doubt that the Presbyterians were materially helped. The brutality of the suppression, furthermore, greatly alienated moderate opinion.^{74.} Nothing more repellent than Dalziel's repeated advice to carry out a policy of extirpation^{75.} could be imagined unless it be similar counsel from a churchman in the person of Archbishop Burnet.^{76.} After Rullion Green the country may be said to have been under military government.^{77.} With the advent of this state of affairs, indeed, came the decline of the Episcopal interest.^{78.}

X. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Sir James Turner's Memoirs. p. 144.
2. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 83 & 84.
3. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 374.
4. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 384.
5. Do. Vol. II. p. 105.
6. Sir John Lauder's Historical Notices. p. 586.
Lamont's Diary. p. 194. Note.
7. Defoe's Memoirs. Part III. pp. 201 & 229.
Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. p. 56.
8. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 263 & 264. Some of
the details given by Rothes are revolting.
Do. pp. 235, 236 & 254.
9. Sir James Turner's Memoirs. pp. 140 & 142.
Kirkton's History. pp. 210, 218 & 248.
10. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 238.
11. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 390.
12. Kirkton's History. pp. 146, 200, 222 & 326.
Narrative of Mr. Nimmo. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. viii.
Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 374. Vol. II. p. 12.
13. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 83.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 237 & 238. cf. p. 257.
Kirkton's History. pp. 258 & 259.
14. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 400.
15. Nicoll's Diary. pp. 391 & 392.
16. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. i.
17. Do. p. iv.
18. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 191 & 192.
19. H.M.C. Heathcote MSS. 1899. p. 144.
Kirkton's History. p. 201.
20. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 375.
21. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. v.
22. Gordon's History. Vol. II. p. 94.
23. Defoe's Memoirs. Part III. pp. 201, 202 & 203.
24. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 386, 388, 389, 390 & 424.
25. Kirkton's History. p. 163.
26. Do. p. 352.
27. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 330.
28. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. xxix & xxxii.
29. H.M.C. Buccleuch MSS. 15th Report. Appendix.
Part VIII. p. 230.
30. Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. IV.
Article "Conventicle". p. 104.
31. H.M.C. Ormonde MSS. N.S. IV. 1906. p. 85.
32. Sir John Lauder's Historical Observes. p. 50.
33. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 128.
34. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 204 & 205.

33. H.M.C. XIII. Part 2. 1893. pp. 40 & 48.
34. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. xx.
35. Law's Memorials. p. 200.
36. Do. pp. 137 & 138.
37. H.M.C. 15th Report. Appendix. Part VIII. Buccleuch
MSS. pp. 272 & 273.
38. H.M.C. 12th Report. Part VIII. MSS. of Duke of Athole
and of the Earl of Home. p. 11.
39. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 233.
See also Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 188.
Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Vol. I.
1893. p. 265.
Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. pp. 58 & 59.
40. Sermons in time of Persecution. p. 415.
Shield's A Hind Let Loose. pp. 444-489.
Brown's Apologetical Relation. p. 163.
41. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 266.
42. Do. Vol. II. p. 237.
43. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. pp. 362 & 363.
44. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. III. pp. 205 & 206.
45. Do. Vol. II. pp. xix, xxxvi, xli, xlii.
46. H.M.C. XIII. Part 2. 1893. pp. 40 & 47.
47. Miscellany of the Maitland Club. Vol. II. Part II.
p. 178.
Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. p. 8.
Mark Napier's Memorials of John Graham of Claverhouse.
p. 267.
H.M.C. 11th Report. Part VI. (1887). pp. 156 & 157.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 222 & 223.
48. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 91.
49. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 44.
Baillie. Vol. I. pp. 116 & 189.
50. Wodrow. Vol. I. pp. 340, 422 & 430. Vol. II. pp. 6,
59 & 214.
51. H.M.C. Various Collections. Vol. V. MSS. of
Sir Archibald Edmonstone of Duntreath. p. 177.
52. Wodrow's History. Vol. I. pp. 374 seq., 411.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 20, 35 & 207.
53. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. p. 68.
54. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 388.
55. Do.
56. Leighton's Works. Vol. II. p. 438.
57. Kirkton's History. p. 213.
58. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 208 & 209.
59. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 424.
60. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. p. 13.
61. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 215.
62. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 1.

63. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Vol. I.
pp. 340-355.
64. Wedrow. Vol. II. p. 13.
65. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 235 & 236.
See also p. xxxiv. Also H.M.C. Laing MSS. I.
1914. p. 351.
66. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 242.
67. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. p. 356.
68. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 252. See also pp. 262
& 263. The different types engaged are given in
Vol. II. pp. 18 & 19.
69. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 252.
70. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. p. 60.
71. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 15.
72. Do. pp. 45 & 46.
73. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. xliii & xliiv.
Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. p. 39.
74. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 434.
75. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. xlviii note. Vol. I.
p. 255.
H.M.C. 3rd Report. Webster MSS. p. 421.
76. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. xlviii.
77. Kirkton's History. p. 259.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 20.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 285.
78. Kirkton's History. pp. 255 & 284.

XI.

THE PEACE POLICY.

The year 1667 marks the beginning of a change in policy regarding the administration of Church and State. Hitherto, as we have seen, the country had been practically under a military government, Dalziel's dictum that "the sword shall govern who will, who will not",¹ holding complete sway. The Scottish nobility had shown their abject servility in passing every cruel and unjust law without any suggestion of regret or dislike. Now, however, after the horrors attendant on the Pentland Rising, there was a certain revulsion of feeling, together with a widespread desire for a more pacific administration. It was the same, too, in the realm of the church where it was felt that a scheme of accommodation or comprehension embracing both Episcopalians and Presbyterians might be possible. This general desire for peace in state and church is everywhere audible in the year 1667. As early as January 30 the Earl of Argyll in a letter to the Duke of Lauderdale makes reference to a meeting attended by the Lord Commissioner, the Archbishop of Glasgow, Hamilton, Montrose, Atholl, Annandale and himself with reference to the methods to be employed to secure peace. "My overture was", he says with regard to the speech he delivered, "to lay something to ther (the disaffected Presbyterians) dore, which they would thinke shame before the world to refuse or pretend to scruple at; and this was to engage to live peaceably, and never to rise in armes against /

against his Ma^{tie}, or his commission, and never to harbour any declared rebell." ² Owing, however, to the opposition of that evil genius, the Archbishop of Glasgow, the plan failed - Argyll himself seems only to have been half-hearted, as his later desire for the employment of more troops shows. ³ Yet his proposal was not without significance. The country as a whole was tired of the incessant use of military forces and while one party was clamorous for their still greater employment, ⁴ another desired their disbandment. ⁵ Lauderdale, indeed, in August, considering it to be for his own interest, did have the army disbanded, ⁶ to the consternation of many of the bishops ⁷ but to the delight of many moderate men like Sir Robert Meray who vouched that whatever designing people might say there was no fear for the country. ⁸ Charles himself showed that he was not altogether unfavourable to the new policy. He bestowed considerable favour on the nonconformists, his real motive, however, being, says Burnet, to win back the Church of England which he had alienated. ⁹ He also expressed his grave displeasure with Sharp ¹⁰ who was ordered to confine himself to his own diocese - whereat he was filled with "deep melancholy" ¹¹ until he was finally reinstated in favour. ¹² Lauderdale, it would seem, made a deliberate effort to get the Archbishop to join in the policy of conciliation. "But it is my humble opinion", he writes in a letter dated 2nd October 1667, "it will not be unfit for your L^{ops} of the clergie to endeavor to moderate severities as much as may consist with the Peace and order of the Church, that as wilfull opposers and contemners /

contemners must be severlie punished So peaceable dissenters may be endeavoured to be reclaimed and that they may have just Cause to thank the Bps. for any indulgence they meet with, To the end the People may more and more be gained to a Love to your Order and Persons." ¹³ One has only to read Sharp's correspondence with Sheldon to see how such advice fell on deaf ears, ¹⁴ though even he undertook, in the event of the country being thoroughly quietened, to see that the clergy did their bit. ¹⁵ The real obstacle in the way of conciliation was the Archbishop of Glasgow who, in his letters to Sheldon, deplored such a policy and expressed his wish for a return to strenuous enforcement of existing laws. ¹⁶ Among those who advocated the pacific policy there was no one who worked more strenuously than Tweeddale. "For God sak", he wrote to Lauderdale, "lett us bot have a tryall of securing the pac and quiet of the country." ¹⁷ In the month of May Moray was successful in breaking up a cabal between the church and the military party. By September even the bishops, as their petition to Lauderdale demonstrates, joined in the cry for peace. The letter was of an adulative and fawning type, Leighton's signature being explained not only by his sincere desire for a new era in Episcopal administration but also by that strange domination which Lauderdale always held over him. ¹⁸ Again in 1667 he had two audiences with the King. He pressed the necessity of more moderate counsels and in particular breached the proposal of a comprehension of the Presbyterian party "by altering the terms of the laws a little, and by such abatements as might preserve the whole /

whole for the future by granting somewhat for the present." As yet, however, he entered into no details.¹⁹ Nor could it be denied that circumstances were becoming more conducive. The fall of Clarendon naturally strengthened the hands of the toleration party. "There is non hear that I have spok uith", wrote Rothes to Lauderdale, "bot rejoaysis at it and all conclouds it uill meack a great chang in the gufferment of affeairs."²⁰ Conventicles, too, were much less violent and less numerous.²¹ Towards the end of 1667 a proclamation was made, inviting all who had been engaged in the recent insurrection to appear before the Council, and subscribe the bonds of peace. With the exception of a few particularly obnoxious persons pardon was promised to all who should comply - which many did, though as usual, the more rigorous Presbyterians held aloof. It was, however, a step in the right direction. "This pardon, such as it was", wrote the perfervid Presbyterian Wodrow, "tended to the quiet of the country, and joined with the disbanding of the army, which was by far the more merciful and gracious act, gave a little breathing to the presbyterians in the west and south."²² On the whole the year 1668 was favourable to the new venture, though there were times when the leaders viewed the situation pessimistically. Even Tweeddale momentarily lost patience with the conventicle keepers and reverted to a counsel of force.²³ Conventicles, however, were rare.²⁴ There was, too, a better spirit shown towards the outed ministers. Soon afterwards, Tweeddale again returning to his wonted peaceable nature, made a sensible suggestion regarding them. The danger of /

of conventicles, he said, "may be prevented if any of the soberest men settled somewhere in churches where there were no danger from them, & but 2 or 3 at one upon trial of their behaviour." ²⁵ Even Sharp, it was said, was in sympathy with the plan. Certainly he got the credit for it, though that may have been merely for political reasons. On the whole, the turbulent western counties seem to have been quietened ²⁶ and Tweeddale prided his party on their success. ²⁷ An incident which was an undoubted obstacle in the way of the peacemakers - made full use of by Archbishop Burnet ²⁸ - was the attempted assassination of Sharp by the fanatic Mitchell. Both Archbishops were embittered. The damaging effect on Leighton's policy certainly cannot be overestimated. The year 1669 was marked by a great increase in the number of conventicles, a fact which was particularly alarming to Kincardine and the peace party. ²⁹ It was also the year of the First Indulgence, when an effort in direct conciliation was made.

The germs of the proposal can be found in 1667, in which year it was the subject of talk at court. In the following year Tweeddale was very active in the scheme, his letters betraying his enthusiasm. He speaks of the difficulty he had in negotiating with Hutchison, the leader of the favourable Presbyterians, and with Sharp who "has no stomach to their (the outed ministers) coming in." ³⁰ He deprecates any element of force - "I would have it given & not taken." ³¹ As a result of his labour and the negotiations he was able on the 7th of June, 1669 to lay before the Privy Council a letter from the King authorizing the Indulgence /

Indulgence and explaining its terms.³² Such of the outed ministers as were considered suitable were to be appointed by the Council to vacant parishes. Those who agreed to take collation from the bishops were to have a right to the stipends - those who did not were to have the manse and glebe with the right to exercise their ministerial office. All were required to hold kirk sessions and attend presbyteries, and forbidden to administer Baptism or the Lord's Supper to any but their own parishioners or to encourage the coming of parishioners of other parishes to hear their preaching.³³ Acting on their instructions the Council admitted twelve ministers and in a short period afterwards, thirty more. Some went to their former parishes and others to different ones but all of them, while adhering to Presbyterianism, extolled the royal clemency and expressed their gratitude.³⁴ It has sometimes been stated that Leighton was the real author of the Indulgence,³⁵ but, on the other hand, Burnet declares him to have been much against it, inasmuch as the success of his accommodation scheme was likely to be remote if the Presbyterians were allowed to return to their benefices.³⁶ Tweeddale certainly deserves the credit - the authorship, moreover, being directly attributed to him by Sir George Mackenzie.³⁷ It soon became apparent that there was great difference of opinion on the new policy.³⁸ The Chancellor was hostile chiefly because he disliked Tweeddale.³⁹ The opposition of the conforming clergy was, of course, assured,⁴⁰ and the attitude of the bishops in general very similar.⁴¹ Many of them, indeed, did their utmost to make the life of the Indulged ministers /

ministers as miserable as possible.^{42.} Sharp, as usual, could play a double game^{43.} but there was no doubt about his deep hostility.^{44.} It was so easy to criticise the new measure. Kirkton enumerated the defects of what he called "a false medicine to skin the ulcer before it was cleansed" viz:- the derivation merely from the King's supremacy, the obtruding of ministers upon the consent of the patron without respect to the call of the people, and the acknowledgment of Episcopal government which last was, for Kirkton, to "doe evil."^{45.} By far the most frequent criticism and jibe was that the Indulgence was the fruit of unblushing Erastianism.^{46.} "It is debated now", wrote W. Douglas to Lauderdale, "what sort of church government wee have, whither Episcopall, Presbiterian or Erastian."^{47.} Despite all criticism, however, whether sincere or such as this, semi-jocular, there were many who appreciated the Indulgence.^{48.} Lauderdale himself considered that it might be instrumental in putting a stop to conventicles.^{49.} He was, however, mistaken, since it synchronised with their greater activity and frequency^{50.} - even in Leighton's diocese.^{51.} The Indulgence, indeed, was a failure, partly because of the strong and influential opposition of Presbyterian ministers in Holland and other parts,^{52.} partly because it was regarded by the great majority of Scottish Presbyterians as a stratagem to bring division into their ranks.^{53.} Even Tweeddale himself admitted that if the policy failed he hoped division might be introduced. Indeed, this is precisely what happened. As Dr. W. Law Mathieson says, the sole effect "was to introduce a wedge of Erastian Presbyterianism into the /

the heart of an Episcopal Church"⁵⁵ - and the Indulgence, instead of being a measure of peace, merely fomented divisions among both Episcopalians and Presbyterians. Archbishop Burnet was the most infuriated against the Indulgence, principally on the score that it had been permitted not by the Archbishops but by the Council. Accordingly, a Synod was held in Glasgow in October and a remonstrance framed inveighing against the Indulgence.⁵⁶ Inasmuch as Burnet had been a continual thorn in the side of the peace party he soon paid for his rashness with the loss of the Archbishopric. Almost immediately after the Synod the Scottish Parliament met at Edinburgh (October 19, 1669), Lauderdale, who had now attained the height of his ambition, being Commissioner. At the opening Leighton distinguished himself by his prayers - "for I wold not", aptly remarked Lauderdale, "have the Presbyterian trick of bringing in Ministers to pray & tell God almighty news from the debates."⁵⁷ The Commissioner in his speech made it plain that it was the will of the King "so long as he wore the Crown to keep up the prelatick government as it was now established by law." This, we are told, "gave lyfe to the prelatick partie", and did "exceedingly discourage the presbyterian party."⁵⁸

A more potent obstacle, however, in the way of any accommodation was the famous Assertory Act of 1669, passed on the 10th of November. It ran -

"The Estates of Parliament do hereby enact, assert and declare that his Majesty hath the supreme authority and supremacy over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical within this kingdom; and that by virtue thereof, the ordering and disposal of the external government and policy of the /

the church doth properly belong to his Majesty and his successors, as an inherent right of the Crown; and that his Majesty and his successors may settle, enact, and emit such constitutions, acts, and orders, concerning the administration of the external government of the church, and the persons employed in the same, and concerning all ecclesiastical meetings and matters to be proposed and determined therein, as they, in their royal wisdom, shall think fit."

This extraordinary piece of legislation fairly took the breath away even from the Episcopalians. "As soon as Sharp saw it", related Lauderdale, "and that by it the clogs laid upon the King in the act of restitution were knocked off with an absolute power in the King to order persons & meetings & matters as should please his Majesty, he took the alarm wondrous haisty, and said wilde things to E. of Tweeddale, that all King Henry the 8th ten years' work was now to be done in 3 dayes, that 4 lines in this act were more comprehensive than a hundred & odd sheets of HB." ⁵⁹ He did, indeed, endeavour to have the clause "as it is settled by law" added by way of limitation but, of course, without success, Lauderdale knowing full well that its inclusion would have wrecked that royal absolutism at which the Act aimed. Sharp, however, submitted and eventually voted for the measure. Leighton's friends, Haira and Charteris, says Burnet, "were highly offended at the act" and thought it "made the King our pope." ⁶⁰ Archbishop Saneroff of Canterbury and some of the English Bishops were equally emphatic in their condemnation. ⁶¹ When friends and sympathisers of the existing government could so speak it is useless to say anything of the scathing remarks of Wodrow ⁶² and Kirkton ⁶³ and other Presbyterians. It is more difficult to explain how Leighton came to be

so closely connected with the infamous Act . He was a member of the Committee of preparation⁶⁴ and he too, like Sharp, who was also a member, voted for it. It has been usual to assert that the rough draft with its explanatory clauses relative to "ecclesiastical affairs" differed largely from the published Act and that the Bishop of Dunblane was deceived thereby,⁶⁵ - and that both he and Tweeddale were under the impression that the Act was framed to justify the Indulgence and remove difficulties from that measure,⁶⁶ nevertheless, it cannot be gainsaid that it is another proof of that strange subserviency he always showed to Lauderdale who, in this, as in everything else, made it his aim to make Charles's absolutism complete.⁶⁷ Where was the voice of the Bishop of Dunblane to be heard against this great national wrong? In after years he always repented of the part he had played, nevertheless, when Archbishop Burnet was expelled from his see through an exercise of the power conferred by the Assertory Act, did he not directly benefit by succeeding to the office? Leighton, it must be confessed, was not alive to the moral and ethical issues of the day. His attention, activity and devotion lay in other directions, a fact which is well seen in the sermon he preached before this very parliament which passed the Assertory Act. Every word breathed reconciliation and peace - fit prelude to the Accommodation movement into which he was soon to fling both heart and soul. "Many things", he said, "about which men dispute very warmly are of remote relation and affinity to the great things of Christianity. Some truths are of so little evidence and importance, that he /

he who errs in them charitably, meekly, and calmly, may be both a wiser man and a better Christian than he who is furiously, stormily, and uncharitably orthodox." ⁶⁸

Such a spirit was altogether admirable but, as he was soon to learn for himself, his tolerance was almost unique in his day. His schemes were to be shipwrecked on the all-embracing intolerance of those - friendly and unfriendly - who surrounded him.

XI. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 19.
2. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. p. 58.
3. Do. p. 65.
4. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 14.
5. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. p. 359.
6. Kirkton's History. pp. 262 & 263.
7. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 80.
8. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 37.
9. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 465.
10. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 12.
11. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 438 & 443.
12. Do. p. 450.
13. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Vol. I. p. 263.
14. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. lv. of. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. p. 123.
15. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 51.
16. Do. p. xlvi.
17. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 45 & 46.
18. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 60.
19. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 454.
20. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 44.
21. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. pp. 118 & 119.
22. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. pp. 362 & 363.
23. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 93.
24. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 102 & 103.
25. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 109.
26. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 105.
27. Do. p. 108.
28. Do. p. 121.
29. Do. p. lxxiii.
30. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 125.
31. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 510.
32. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 118.
33. Do. p. 126. See also pp. 105, 107, 108, 109 & 121.
34. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 515.
35. Kirkton's History. pp. 288 & 289.
36. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 193.
37. Pearson's Life of Leighton prefixed to Works. p. LXVII note.
38. See also Robert Simpson's History of Scotland. pp. 155 & 156.
39. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 507.
40. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 189.
41. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 135.

39. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 189.
40. H.M.C. 11th Report. Part VI. 1887. pp. 156 & 157.
41. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 131.
Law's Memorials. pp. 20 & 21.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 518.
42. Wodrow. Vol. II. pp. 147, 184 & 185.
43. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 509.
44. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. p. 373.
45. Kirkton's History. pp. 289, 290, 291, 334 & 335.
See also Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 94, 95, 198.
p. LXVI. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 517.
46. See e.g. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 133.
Law's Memorials. pp. 51, 152, 153 & 154.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 516.
47. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. p. 375.
48. e.g. Defoe's Memoirs. Part III. p. 226.
Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 134.
Law's Memorials. pp. 72, 87 & 88.
Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 508 & 516.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 194, 195, 196 & 197.
Kirkton's History. pp. 290, 334 & 335.
49. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 149.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 119 & 120.
50. Kirkton's History. pp. 298, 342 & 343.
51. Extracts from the Presbytery Books of Dalkeith.
Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries. Vol. IV.
pp. 459-489.
52. Wodrow. Vol. II. pp. 135 & 210.
Law's Memorials. pp. 152, 153, 154 & 196.
53. Defoe's Memoirs. Part III. p. 216.
Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 135.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 517.
54. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 197.
55. Politics and Religion. William Law Mathieson. Vol. II.
p. 236.
56. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. lxiv-lxvi.
Law's Memorials. pp. 20 & 21.
57. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 142.
58. Law's Memorials. p. 20.
59. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 152 & 153.
60. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 521.
See also Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 139.
61. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII. p. 178.
62. Wodrow's History. Vol. II. p. 137 seq.
63. Kirkton's History. p. 303.
64. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 151 & 152.
65. Pearson's Edition of Leighton's Works. p. lxxvi.
66. Do.
67. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 144, 145 & 150.
68. Leighton's Works. Vol. II. p. 424.

XII.

THE ACCOMMODATION MOVEMENT.

It is necessary to understand that Leighton's accommodation to the narration of which we are now approaching - was not an isolated and spasmodic movement but part of that wider effort for reconciliation which was everywhere apparent in England and Scotland in the seventeenth century. Even in Scotland from Reformation times there had been a party - small and uninfluential no doubt - that desired to tread the middle way between extremes. Knox himself, may it be said, had taken no advanced views on church polity, his aim being to combine what was best in Episcopacy and Presbytery. "Mr. Knox, and the rest of the ministers, together with the lords of the congregation", said Bishop Guthrie in his Memoirs, "founded the government of the church in a moderate impartiality."¹ This seems to have been Baillie's opinion too. "We are persuaded in our mindes, for all that we have yet heard", he wrote to Archibald Johnston, "that some Episcopacie diverse from that of St. Paul's, to witt, that of the constant Moderator in the Ancient, and of the Superintendents in the Reformed church, was never abjured by our Church."² Knox's policy was continued by such men as John Craig, Erskine of Dun and David Lindsay. Craig publicly lamented that "there was no neutral man to make agreement between the two parties."³ Erskine of Dun, too, agreed to the Modified Episcopacy of 1572, though under protestation until better times.⁴ Indeed, right down to Leighton's own day the party may be said always to have /

have existed. In England - to the study of whose accommodation movements we shall come in the second part of this thesis - as far back as the Hampton Court Conference the Puritans had urged as a compromise that the bishop might be assisted by his presbyters in the diocesan synod regarding difficult questions. James's violence, however, prevented any agreement on these lines.

In the years 1637 and 1638 the quarrels of Charles I. and his Scottish subjects raised the whole question of accommodation again. In the former year the Archbishop of St. Andrews, the Earls of Traquair and Roxburgh and the Bishops of Edinburgh, Lismore, Galloway and Dunblane recommended a conference with opponents to discover any line of compromise, which, if found, was to be ratified by a National Assembly.⁵ It was, however, without effect. In 1638 the desire for Moderate Episcopacy was again audible. The Marquis of Hamilton, writing to Charles, stated that a compromise might be accomplished if the power of the bishops was limited by certain caveats established by parliament.⁶ The King, in fact, did instruct Hamilton to call an Assembly and a Parliament, stating he might assent to any plea for making bishops responsible to future Assemblies but was to protest against any proposal to abolish Episcopacy.⁷ From Baillie's description of the time we can see there was a chance of success⁸ but the violence, not only of the bishops,⁹ but also of the Glasgow Assembly of 1638¹⁰ put an effectual stop to the movement. From the interpretation of the [Solemn League and] Covenant held by the majority attending that Assembly it was evident that nothing short of /

of the total abolition of Episcopacy would find favour.¹¹ The potent adverse influence of Henderson, the ablest of the Presbyterians, was also an insuperable obstacle in the way of Moderate Episcopacy.¹² Even Baillie's support - apparently - was fitful and lukewarm, he sometimes speaking in opposition with words as bitter as those of Henderson or Rutherford.¹³ The Long Parliament of 1640 seems to have been not altogether unfavourable to a path of compromise.

"All are for creating a kind of presbytery, and for bringing down the bishops in all things spiritual and temporal, so long as can be with any subsistence; but their utter abolition, which is the only aim of the most godly, is the knot of the whole question."

So wrote Baillie,¹⁴ with a sigh of regret. In Scotland, too, in the year 1641 - we know this on the evidence of the Marquis of Hamilton - schemes of comprehension were still in the air,¹⁵ while in the year 1643 and the following years Baillie gives expression to further hopes in this direction.¹⁶ In 1644 Cromwell spoke of accommodation for the Independents,¹⁷ while in 1641 came Ussher's great scheme, so far the most ambitious and important. Bramhall, who disliked the Scottish bishops generally, and Jeremy Taylor were both sympathetic to the scheme - a scheme to appoint a suffragan bishop for each rural deanery, who should be guided in his actions by a monthly synod of his clergy, and an arrangement for an annual synod of suffragan bishops and specially chosen parochial clergy to assist and advise the diocesan bishop. The great name of Ussher, however, we shall study more minutely later. This plan found favour with many. The Presbyterian Baxter /

Barter, preaching before Parliament in 1660, said that it was easy for moderate men to come to a fair agreement, that, indeed, Archbishop Ussher and he had agreed in half an hour.¹⁸ Another plan proffered by Archbishop Williams proposed that "every bishop shall have twelve assistants besides the dean and chapter; four to be chosen by the King, four by the Lords, and four by the Commons, for jurisdiction and ordination."¹⁹ Sir E. Deering also made a proposal very similar to that of Ussher. Owing, however, to the unyielding attitude of the bishops the schemes came to nought - because, said Baillie, these men never opened their mouth "against any of the Canterburian abominations."²⁰ In 1646 there was much talk among the Independents on the question of accommodation on the lines of moderate Episcopacy²¹ - a project to which Baillie often refers in his pages²² - and in 1648 there were many meetings in London to effect an accommodation between them and the Presbyterians but again with no success.²³

In 1659 General Monk commended "a moderate Presbytery",²⁴ and with the Restoration came a flood of comprehension schemes. Some were of the opinion of Dr. William Forbes that the difference between papists and the Reformed Church could be reconciled²⁵ and so spoke of reunion with Rome. Charles himself, it has been said, was deeply engaged to this end.²⁶ Reunion, too, with the Orthodox Eastern Churches seems to have been contemplated. Certainly, throughout the seventeenth century, friendly relations existed.²⁷ The Presbyterians, in particular, were jubilant at the King's return - they considering his declaration from Breda as a promise for /

for their comprehension in the National Church. They had now the support of the Earl of Clarendon and Lord Southampton but the bishops generally were in opposition. As Burnet says, they were interested parties, the Presbyterians being in possession of most of the western benefices.²⁸ On the 22nd of October, 1660 a conference was held before the King at the Lord Chancellor's between Bishops and Presbyterian ministers. "The Presbyterians", wrote a correspondent to Sir Richard Lovelace, "agreed to an Episcopall government, but they would not have the Bishops have any power but joyntly with the presbiters, and with their consent, at last they agreed that the Bishop should act with the advice and assistance of his prebends and six ministers of the dioces: the Presbyterians pleaded much for a power of suspension from the communion to be given to ministers, but that would not be granted, and they yielded at last that power only to the Bishop and his assistants they are agreed in all matters and very suddenly."²⁹

A passage like this proves how near the two parties really were, and how effectually a compromise might have been effected on the lines indicated. Indeed, so similar are the proposals that they seem to have been almost precedents to Leighton's own scheme.³⁰ The King issued a Declaration, meeting practically all of the Presbyterian grievances, but the Bill introduced into Parliament to give effect to it was rejected by the Commons. There is little reason to credit Charles with any sincerity in the matter.

On April 15, 1661 took place the most far-reaching and ambitious conference between the parties that had as yet been held -
the /

the Savoy Conference. The Presbyterians made many demands of a trivial character, the main ones being that Ussher's reduction should be submitted as a groundwork and that bishops should not govern their diocese by their single authority nor depute it to lay officers in their courts but should, in matters of ordination and jurisdiction, take along with them the counsel and concurrence of the presbyters.³¹ Sheldon, however, yielded nothing and the Anglican party as a whole conducted itself with such an overbearing and vindictive spirit that the Conference ended in a complete failure. A great opportunity had been offered and lost.³²

It was an age when travel and other causes made men more broad and tolerant,³³ when the growing latitudinarian outlook lent impetus to the movement,³⁴ and so the Conference and the spirit of those who attended it thwarted and stifled the visions of a great comprehensive church as held by men like Stillingfleet³⁵ and Baxter.³⁶ In Scotland it was the same story - a party eager for negotiation and a majority as bitter against. Nevertheless, the conciliatory party always existed, a party which, like Sir Alexander Morison of Prestongrange was not averse to a moderate Episcopacy.³⁷ Glencairn himself declared, even on his death-bed, that his aim had never been for more than a moderate Episcopacy - "but he felt to his sad experience, the prelates now brought in to be very far from moderation."³⁸ In 1665 Kincardin's influence on the side of the peace-party was a potent factor,³⁹ while in the following year Tweeddale, Moray and Lauderdale greatly added to its prestige and importance. /

importance.⁴⁰ There were, says the historian Kirkton, several circumstances which argued for clemency on the part of the governors - the King's failure in the Dutch War, the heroism of the people which made the bishops odious, the change in the King's Cabinet Counsellors that had laid aside Chancellor Hyde, the inclination of the new governors who neither loved the bishops nor hated godly men as much as their predecessors, and lastly, the fact that, in England, the King encouraged such nonconformists as Manton and Bates to hold their meetings.⁴¹ The great obstacle was Archbishop Burnet. "Our ejected and dis-satisfied ministers pleade everywhere", he writes to Sheldon on August 9, 1667, "that they are not against Bishops, but allow episcopos praesides who shall preside in ther meetings but have no more power than any ordinary presbyter, and thus in their wisdoms they propose as an expedient to reconcile the presbyterian and episcopall church. However we are sure that they who speake this moderate language are great favourites, if your Gr/ heare any such motions made we hope you will put a stop to them till we be heard pleade for the Church."⁴² With such a spirit coming from an Archbishop the times seemed inauspicious to the peace-party. Burnet's character has often been defended⁴³ and more often arraigned⁴⁴ yet there is little doubt that his appointment was one of the most unfortunate of the time. Nevertheless, when they considered the favour that Charles extended to Bridgeman's accommodation⁴⁵ the Scottish Presbyterians felt justified in continuing their efforts. Tweeddale was particularly active and often in conversation with Robert Douglas /

Douglas and John Stirling, his parish minister, on a proposal which Kirkton defines as "a liberty for presbyterian ministers to execute their ministry without dependence on the bishops."⁴⁶ In addition, Linlithgow made his own proposals⁴⁷ and altogether the time seemed fairly propitious for a compromise of some sort.

A supreme difficulty, however, that was felt among Presbyterians was that any kind of moderate Episcopacy was directly forbidden by the terms of the Solemn League and Covenant. Leighton, as we have seen, in his Presbyterian days signed this document, though in later years he inveighed against its intolerance, and was peculiarly fitted to understand the uncertainties of "tender consciences." In this connection we have two interesting letters written by him for private circulation which form in themselves a practical apologetic on the subject. Episcopal government, managed in conjunction with Presbyters in Presbyteries and Synods is, he says, agreeable to scripture and the example of the Primitive Church.⁴⁸ Moreover, contrary to popular opinion, it is quite in keeping with the Covenant itself. That document had many blemishes, particularly its unparalleled intolerance,⁴⁹ yet it is quite possible to be true to it and the present government as well.⁵⁰ This is shown by the proposals submitted by English Presbyterians to the King, which embrace a form of Synodical government "conjunct with a fixed Presidency or Episcopacy" which are calculated to promote order, godliness and discipline and which will, moreover, save the nation from the violence and intolerance of the Covenant.⁵¹ The prelacy condemned by that document /

document is the type wherein the sole power of Ordination, Jurisdiction and Discipline was engrossed by the bishops and their delegates to the exclusion of ^{pastors and} private churches.^{52.}

Leighton goes on to prove this by quotations from the Presbyterian Baxter, to the effect that the words added in explication of the abjuration of "Prelacy" - "Church-government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other Ecclesiastical Officers depending on that Hierarchy" - were against the English hierarchy and not against Episcopacy in general.^{53.}

Indeed, says Baxter, in Scotland they had had visitors and Moderators of Synods - which demonstrated a moderate Episcopacy.^{54.} Leighton further subjoins a quotation from Theophilus Timereus to the same effect - that the Covenant did not abjure all Episcopacy. There was in 1643, Leighton argues, no Episcopacy in Scotland and therefore it was the English form that was aimed against. After the Restoration terms such as Dean, Chapter and Commissaries were used in Scotland, but, he rejoins, none of these exercised any of the discipline under the name, nor yet did delegates from the bishops to the total exclusion of the presbyters.^{55.}

No doubt, he admits, the generality of the people and the ministers took the Covenant in the belief that it abjured all Episcopacy. They should now, however, when their mistake is pointed out, reconsider the situation.^{56.} The present church, he says, in doctrine, worship and discipline differed in nothing from its predecessor (a fact which we have already seen to be true) and the desertion of their posts by the Presbyterians /

Presbyterians - though he is quite ready to admire their stand for conscience - was rather indefensible.⁵⁷ "Oh", he concludes, "who would not long for the shadows of the evening, and to be at rest from all these poor childish, trifling contests!"⁵⁸

The second letter is much shorter and less important, merely referring to certain arguments ad hominem. There may be, he admits, no direct command in scripture for Episcopacy but then is Presbytery in any better case?⁵⁹ It is for the party claiming Divine Right to adduce scripture proof. Leighton again refers to the objection of the Covenant and reiterates his argument of the first letter that the Episcopacy therein rejected is not the Moderate Episcopacy he advocated.⁶⁰ Finally, he adds, "He that cannot join with the present frame of this Church, could not have lived in the communion of the Christian Church in the time of the first most famous General Assembly of it, the Council of Nice."⁶¹

Such were Leighton's two letters, composing in themselves a powerful apologetic on lines unique at the time. It is only to be regretted that they were not made more public than they were. The contention that moderate Episcopacy was consonant with the principles of the Church of Scotland was, as we have already seen, historically correct. His farther contention that the Solemn League and Covenant was no real obstacle, that its wording only referred to a definite type of lordly prelacy was doubtless also correct, inasmuch as Baillie, as well as the English Presbyterians were of like mind. Verbally, his argument may be admitted, but actually it may be doubted that the framers of the Solemn League and /

and Covenant differentiated so nicely among the different types of Episcopacy. When one considers the general temper of the 1638 General Assembly of Glasgow it seems hardly likely. As far as it went, however, and taking the words just as they were, Leighton stood on very strong ground.

XII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Bishop Guthrie's Memoirs. p. 1.
2. Baillie's Letters and Journals, Vol. I. p. 178.
3. D.N.B. Vol. XII. Article "John Craig". (Aeneas Mackay).
4. D.N.B. Vol. XVII. Article "John Erskine of Dun".
(F.F. Henderson).
5. H.M.C. 9th Report. Traquair MSS. p. 253. Part II.
6. Hamilton Papers. pp. 5 & 11.
7. D.N.B. Vol. XXIV. Article "James Hamilton, 3rd Marquis
and 1st Duke of Hamilton. 1606-1649. (S.R. Gardiner).
p. 180.
See also Baillie. Vol. I. p. 104.
8. Baillie. Vol. I. pp. 112, 119, 122 & 123.
9. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 143. p. xxxii.
10. Hume Brown's History of Scotland. Vol. II. p. 308.
11. G.P. Fisher's History of Christian Doctrine. p. 359.
12. D.N.B. Vol. XIV. Article "Alexander Henderson".
(A. Gordon). p. 392.
13. See e.g. his Letters and Journals. Vol. I. pp. 2, 9, 67,
68, 178, 179, 156, 158, xxxv, xxxi. Vol. III. pp. 401
and 406. Vol. I. p. 23, xlii. Vol. II. pp. 252
and 253.
See also D.N.B. Vol. II. Article "Robert Baillie".
(A.B. Grosart). p. 420.
14. Wodrow. Vol. I. pp. 288 & 289.
15. Baillie's Letters. Vol. I. p. 245.
16. H.M.C. 6th Report. 1877. Argyll MSS. p. 621.
17. Baillie. Vol. II. pp. 57, 248, 326 & 355.
18. Baillie. Vol. II. p. 226.
19. Baxter. Life and Times. II. 217-218. *ibid.* II. 232.
20. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. II. p. 400.
21. Baillie. Vol. I. p. 287.
22. H.M.C. 11th Report. Part VI. (1887). p. 114.
23. Hamilton Papers. p. 99.
24. Miscellany of the Maitland Club. Vol. IV. Part I. 1847.
pp. 156 & 167.
25. Baillie. Vol. II. pp. 260, 325, 326, 327, 328 & 343.
26. Hamilton Papers. p. 172.
27. H.M.C. Ormonds. N.S. 1. 1902. p. 333.
28. Scot. Hist. Review. Vol. 15. 1918. p. 128.
29. Dictionary of English Church History. Ollard and Grosse.
p. 504. *But of.* Burnet. Vol. I. p. 356.
30. Dictionary of English Church History. Ollard and Grosse.
p. 507.
31. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 323.
32. H.M.C. 5th Report. Duke of Sutherland MSS. at Trentham.
p. 157.
33. See also for an accommodation movement Baillie Vol. III.
p. 410.

31. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 326.
32. Hallam's Const. Hist. p. 523.
33. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. pp. 62 & 63.
34. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 476.
35. Dictionary of English Church History. Ollard and Crosse.
pp. 573 & 574.
36. Evangelical Succession. Second Series. pp. 227 & 228.
37. Kirkton's History. pp. 204 & 205.
38. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 417.
39. D.N.B. Vol. VII. Article "Alexander Bruce". (Osmund
Airy). p. 87.
40. Kirkton's History. p. 266.
41. Do. p. 268.
42. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. xlviii/xlix.
43. H.M.C. Laing MSS. I. 1914. p. 426.
Also Gordon's Scotichronicon.
44. Kirkton's History. pp. 210, 218 & 269.
Historical Observes. pp. 136 & 137.
D.N.B. Vol. VII. Article "Alexander Burnet". (Osmund
Airy). p. 392.
- Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. pp. 58 & 59 & 60.
- Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 172.
- Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 384, 432, 435 & 444.
- Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 8.
45. D.N.B. Vol. X. Article "Charles II." (A.W. Ward).
p. 96.
46. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 477.
Kirkton's History. p. 276.
See also Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 49, 50 & 105.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 454.
47. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 96 seq.
48. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII. pp. 184 & 192.
49. Do. p. 184. Also pp. 190, 194 & 212.
50. Do. p. 184.
51. Do. pp. 184 & 185.
52. Do. p. 185.
53. Do. p. 185 seq. p. 194.
54. Do. 186.
55. Do. pp. 187 & 188.
56. Do. p. 188.
57. Do. p. 190.
58. Do. p. 190.
59. Do. p. 193.
60. Do. p. 194.
61. Do. p. 195.

XIII.

THE LEIGHTON ACCOMMODATION.

We have now surveyed Scottish ecclesiastical history in the seventeenth century, noting particularly the moderate nature of early Scottish Episcopacy. We have examined the National Covenant of 1638, and the ensuing Glasgow General Assembly with a view to shewing in what way moderate opinion was alienated. The Solemn League and Covenant in turn, together with the quarrels of Protesters and Resolutioners, was shown to issue in similar effects. Particular attention was devoted to the question as to whether the Scottish soil was congenial to any form of Episcopacy. We have concluded that, with careful handling, there was a chance of success.

We now come to the nomen praeclarissimum of Scottish Accommodationists - Robert Leighton, who was to Scotland what Stillingfleet was to England and Ussher to Ireland. Undoubtedly, this last it was who supplied him with his model - the details of which, however, we shall examine when we come to the part of the thesis dealing with Ireland.

Leighton, as far as church polity was concerned, belonged to the latitudinarian school. Not that, in his time, he stands alone in this respect. Kirkton speaks of the Episcopal party as calling "ordinarily the government of the church a point indifferent"¹ and Wodrow speaks in the same strain.² Certainly it represented the view of many individuals. It was that of Sir John Lauder, /

Lander,³ Sir Matthew Hale,⁴ Sir John Cunningham,⁵ Archibald, Earl of Argyll,⁶ Stillingfleet,⁷ Robert Burnet (the Bishop's father),⁸ The Duchess of Hamilton,⁹ The Earl of Kincardine,¹⁰ and the Earl of Tweeddale.¹¹ Even James Nimmo's relatives do not appear to have displayed his own fanaticism on this question.¹² Sharp himself showed considerable latitude. "I doe think y^t the substantialls of presbyterian government have a founda^on in scripture", he writes, "yet I am not of ther opinion, who will have the integrant parts of the constitution & way of it, as it hath been exercised in Scotland these years past to be iure divine."¹³ Leighton shows a like attitude. He cannot hide his own predilections, it must be confessed. He pronounces himself against monarchical prelacy¹⁴ yet expresses his admiration of the primitive church.¹⁵ He refers to the claims of Presbytery to divine right and notes that other forms of church government are not so dogmatic.¹⁶ He admits that God has been more express in the officers and government of His Church than of civil society,¹⁷ nevertheless, there is a great latitude left as to the form of government that should be. The matter of government is not of primary importance.

"I confess I have sometimes wondered to see some wise and good men, after all that can be said to them, make so great reckoning of certain metaphysical exceptions against some little modes and formalities of difference in the government, and set so little a value upon so great a thing as is the Peace of the Church."¹⁸

So he writes.

And, indeed, Leighton's life was a reflection of his mind, for did he not sign the Covenants, accept office under Cromwell and /

and a bishopric from Charles II? Nevertheless, like Sharp, he condemned separatism and schism. The former in a letter to Lady Methven commends "her aversion to joyn in society with separatists and partaking of that sin",¹⁹ while the latter in one of his letters speaks almost as strongly.

On the question of orders it must be said that Leighton's views were so lax as almost to border on non-existence. It cannot be asserted he made any marked defence of Presbyterian orders. Even Archbishop Ussher and Bishop Morton made a better. In 1661 he submitted to reordination as deacon and priest, holding that the "re-ordaining a priest ordained in another church imported no more, but that they received him into orders according to their own rules; and did not infer the annulling the orders he had formerly received."²⁰ "The English prelates, however," says William Law Mathieson, "as Leighton very well knew, imagined that they were giving him something which he had hitherto been without, and thus by countenancing the monstrous absurdity, which he entirely disbelieved, that there could be no valid ministry without bishops, he threw a fresh and most formidable obstacle in the way of that union of Episcopalians and Presbyterians which he was so anxious to promote."²¹ Certainly Leighton's views, if any, were of a somewhat eclectic nature, and his private interpretation of the ceremony, in face of what he knew to be the views of the English bishops, was somewhat unworthy of him. There is no doubt that it was tantamount to the surrender of Presbyterian orders - which, assuredly, was very far from what he really thought.

Leighton's /

Leighton's views, it must be confessed, are the most unsatisfactory in his scheme.

Let us now look at his accommodation effort. Archbishop Burnet's enforced resignation of his see took place on December 24, 1669. Lauderdale and Tweeddale immediately pressed Leighton to succeed but he was most reluctant. When, however, the King agreed to his proposals and the paper embodying these was corrected by Moray and turned into instructions for Lauderdale to have legalised, he acquiesced, his hope being that he might be instrumental in consummating the conciliation policy. Lauderdale, however, who, according to Sir John Lauder, only showed a favourable countenance to regain his lost credit,²² was fast losing what esteem he had among the Presbyterians,²³ and had no real liking for the accommodation.²⁴ Even Tweeddale was not hopeful of the result.²⁵ Yet Leighton resolved to persevere. It would appear from the Register of the Parliamentary Council that though nominated and presented he was never formally translated to the see of Glasgow. "July 1670, Mr. Robert Leighton, Bishop of Dunblaine, is set over Glasgow diocese, he comes to Glasgow", records Law, "keeps a synod at Peebles, and another at Glasgow, the said month, under the name of Commendator, or he to whom the affairs of that synod or diocese was intrusted, a comenda, a trustie."²⁶ He did not retire from his work at Dunblane, it appears, but discharged its duties, as well as those of the see of Glasgow. Formally, he became Archbishop of Glasgow in 1671 but not actually till 1672 when he attended his last Synod of Dunblane. /

Dunblane. With his usual disregard for money he refused to accept more than one-fifth of the income. "The King askt me what the rent of Glasgow amounts to", wrote Moray to Lauderdale, "I told him I thought about 1000 lb, and that B. Lighton required no more but to live & spend all his rent before the year's end upon the poor."²⁴ Lighton held his first Synod at Glasgow in August 1670 and in his discourse preached in a strain very different from his predecessor - that they should have their eyes on the things that are above and bear their cross of ill usage and contempt with patience. The clergy, it was said, were greatly surprised at this new tone and marvelled that their new Archbishop should counsel the giving up of compulsion.²⁸ Hearing of many cases of scandal among the clergy Lighton had a committee appointed, of which Charteris, Hairn and Aird were members, and to which the King's Council also added lay commissioners. Of this committee both Kirkton and Wodrow give unfavourable pictures.

"The Committee had no will of a wide door to encourage complainers and therefore at first would gladly have made it a rule, that no man should be heard against a curat except he took the declaration, for this they were reprov'd by lawyers, and so laid it aside. But if any failed in proving his lybell, they made him confess his slander before the congregation in sackcloth."²⁹

Flagrant delinquents, Kirkton continues, were left unpunished, so that the good Bishop himself was ashamed.³⁰ Wodrow, who also gives an adverse picture, says the efforts at amendment were quite "superficial".³¹ Yet, that he did take steps against notable guilty parties is not denied by either Kirkton or Wodrow and is proved by unbiassed evidence.³² Lighton does at times appear in the /

the role of disciplinarian, and seems to have endeavoured to make the Glasgow diocese as orderly as that of Dunblane which he had just left.

Leighton's next move was to send a mission to the western counties - the stronghold of Presbyterianism - to popularise the accommodation. It consisted of Gilbert Burnet, Nairn, Charteris, Aird, Cook and Paterson. Kirkton speaks very unfavourably of the party. Burnet, he says, never spoke the language of an exercised conscience, Charteris was unfit to make proselytes because of his cold utterance, Nairn, their paragon, was a man of gifts, but much suspected as unsound, James Aird was "commonly called Mr. Leighton's ape, because he could imitate his shrugge and grimache, but never more of him", while Cook and Paterson were quite insignificant persons.³³ Kirkton, however, there can be no doubt, was unduly partial and the men, all of them, were of the school of Leighton, moderate in type and ready to compromise in the interests of peace. The mission, however, was a complete failure. "Leighton's Evangelists", as they were called, succeeded in raising the curiosity of the populace but not in gaining them to their side. Burnet, in particular, refers to the extraordinary knowledge the simple cottagers had of scripture and how, at every turn, they could quote texts to their discomfiture.³⁴ Presbyterian propagandists were as active as Episcopalian, and no favourable atmosphere for the conferences that were soon to take place, can be said to have been created. Charles, in fact, had just been counselling Lauderdale to still greater severities.³⁵ Indeed, when the conferences /

conferences were being held the Conventicles were being handled with harshness and determination.³⁶ 1670 was the year of a second Conventicle Act in England which encouraged the degrading work of informers, the testimony of any Justice of the Peace on the oath of two witnesses being sufficient proof of an offence. When the news of the severities made its way to Scotland it cannot be wondered at that the Presbyterians regarded the peace movement as a shallow sham and a snare. It was vain for Charles to say that in Scotland disaffected ministers were not to be molested, if only they were peaceable and submitted to the government,³⁷ while in England Archbishop Sheldon roundly commended the terms of the second Conventicle Act. Scotsmen had only had too long an experience of Charles to trust him.

Leighton now devoted himself, despite the unfavourable environment, to his comprehension movement in the series of Conferences lasting from August 1670 till January 1671 but, it is well to note that his wider international interests are demonstrated by his nomination on July 28, along with Sharp and Bishop Hamilton of Galloway among the bishops as a Commissioner to meet with the English Commissioners to treat of the Union of the two Kingdoms.³⁸

Before taking formal steps, however, for a conference with the ministers he had circulated privately two letters - an irenicum - the gist of their argument being that the Covenant leagued men against the forms of Episcopacy prevalent in England and not against all forms of Episcopacy - as was popularly supposed. The English Presbyterians, notably Baxter, it is stressed /

stressed, were of this opinion. The exiled Covenanter, Robert M'Ward, having acquired these letters, published them - the only writings of Leighton published in his lifetime.

The proposals were -

1. That the Church should be governed by the Bishops and their Presbyters conjointly in their Synods. The Bishops should merely act as Presidents, and in matters both of jurisdiction and ordination should be guided by the majority of their Presbyters.
2. That the Presbyters should be allowed to declare that they submitted to the Bishops only for peace' sake.
3. That the Bishops should not claim a negative vote.
4. That Provincial Synods should sit in every third year, or oftener, if the King should summon them, with power to hear complaints against the Bishops and censure them.

(See Leighton's Works, Vol. VII, p. 184 seq. and p. 179).

As regards the first Conference at Holyrood House, Edinburgh, on August 9, 1670, the King's Commissioner first wrote to the most prominent of the Indulged ministers, Hutchison of Irvine, Wedderburn of Kilmarnock, Ramsay and Baird of Paisley and Gombil of Symington, asking them to come to Edinburgh on matters of importance - Leighton himself having advised them beforehand of this invitation. The day of the Conference came round and the invited ministers arrived, together with Lauderdale, Leighton, Tweeddale, Kincardine, Gilbert Burnet and Patterson, afterwards Archbishop of Glasgow. Sharp refused to countenance the meeting. Burnet's report is interesting.

"Leighton/

"Leightoun laid before them the mischief of our divisions, and of the schism that they had occasioned: many souls were lost, and many more were in danger by these means: so that every one ought to do all he could to heal this wide breach, that had already let in so many evils among us, which were like to make way to many more: for his own part, he was persuaded that episcopacy, as an order distinct from presbyters, had continued in the church ever since the days of the apostles; that the world had everywhere received the Christian religion from bishops, and that a parity among clergymen was never thought of in the church before the middle of the last century, and was then set up rather by accident than on design; yet, how much soever he was persuaded of this, since they were of another mind, he was now to offer a temper to them, by which both sides might still preserve their opinions, and yet unite in carrying on the ends of the gospel and their ministry: they had moderators amongst them, which was no divine institution, but only a matter of order: the king therefore might name these: and the making them constant could be no such encroachment on their function, as that the peace of the church must be broke on such an account: nor could they say, that the blessing of the men named to this function by an imposition of hands did degrade them from their former office, to say no more of it: so they were still at least ministers: it is true, others thought they had a new and special authority, more than a bare presidency: that did not concern them, who were not required to concur with them in anything, but in submitting to this presidency: and, as to that, they should be allowed to declare their own opinion against it, in as full and as public a manner as they pleased: he laid it to their consciences, to consider of the whole matter, as in the presence of God, without any regard to party or popularity. . . . Hutchison answered, and said, their opinion for a parity among the clergy was well known: the presidency now spoke of had made way to a lordly dominion in the church: and therefore how inconsiderable soever the thing might seem to be, yet the effects of it both had been and would be very considerable." ^{39.}

Hutchison asked that, in the circumstances, they might have leave to consult their brethren - a request which the Commissioner readily granted.

A second Conference was held, "in which matters were more fully opened and pressed home, on the grounds formerly mentioned." ⁴⁰

It /

It is surprising to read that both parties even dined together though it was with difficulty that Leighton restrained Lauderdale from showing his ill temper. According to Burnet, Sharp, who had no sympathy with the project, declared that Episcopacy was being undermined, since the negative vote was to be sacrificed.⁴¹ The clergy generally thought that if the Presbyterians were to be brought in they would be neglected. "But the far greater part of the nation approved of this design", he says, "and they reckoned, either we should gain our point, and then all would be at quiet, or, if such offers were rejected by the presbyterians, it would discover their temper, and alienate all indifferent men from them; and the nation would be convinced how unreasonable and stubborn they were, and how unworthy they were of any further favour."⁴² The Indulged ministers, it seems, before meeting with their non-Indulged brethren had asked Leighton that his proposals might be given to them in writing but the bishop, Wodrow asserts, neglected to do so. Accordingly, they drew up the substance for themselves.

"Presbyteries being set up by law as they were established before the year 1638, and the bishop passing from his negative voice, and we having liberty to protest and declare against any remainder of prelatic power retained, or that may happen at any time to be exercised by him, for a salvo for our consciences from homologation thereof; Quæritur, whether we can, with safety to our consciences and principles, join in these presbyteries? Or, what else it is that we will desire or do for peace in the church, and an accommodation, episcopacy being always preserved?"⁴³

The ministers agreed unanimously, however, that the concessions were not sufficient "to be a foundation of their sitting and acting in presbyteries and synods with the prelates."⁴⁴ Wodrow

gives /

gives an epitome of the principal objections. In the first place, he says, it was declared that, while it was a fact that ministers did sit and act with bishops before 1638, presbyterian government was then "in possessorie", by standing acts of parliament not rescinded. At that time the bishops were merely obtruded upon presbyteries and synods but now presbyteries were illegal. The government and policy of the church are now dependent on the "royal supremacy" as an inherent prerogative of the crown, by virtue of which bishops are allowed to assume whom they please, in presbyteries and synods, as mere assistants. These meetings now entirely depend upon the King's supremacy, and the prelates as his substitutes.⁴⁵ After 1612, too, the bishops were invested with the essential power of the keys viz:- ordination and jurisdiction.⁴⁶ Again, grave objection was taken to Leighton's vacillating and uncertain voice regarding the bishop's negative vote. When asked what he would do if he could not agree on any point with the presbytery he had answered that he would enter his dissent against them - and when pressed as to whether his dissent would be any more than that of another he had declined to reply, that giving the impression that he retained the negative vote.⁴⁷ Further, a protestation against the episcopal constitution, while they sat and acted with a bishop, would be "protestatio contraria facto", and so no salve to their conscience. Again, they were to be without ruling elders, officers, in their opinion, of Christ's institution.⁴⁸ In fine, the bishop in the presbytery was still clothed with an episcopal power, though he should, /

should, for a while, lay aside the exercise of it; and they reckoned their sitting with him homologated episcopacy.⁴⁹

It must be admitted that all of these objections were very pointed and valid, all referring, in a word, to the Erastian nature of the accommodation, which, as we shall see, was the fatal flaw that ruined its chances.

The ministers who had attended the first Holyrood Conference returned on the day appointed only to find that Tweeddale and the others were in London. Meanwhile, Leighton sent letters to them requesting a conference with Indulged and non-Indulged and offering to explain his proposals and add concessions. At the same time, says Wedrow, the bishop was writing to his friends and inveighing against the Presbyterians. Hutchison and Wedderburn protested about this to Leighton but agreed to another conference - if legally allowed - which was accordingly arranged to be at Paisley on December 14, 1670.⁵⁰ The fact that the Indulged had taken counsel with what was really the old Protestant party was adequate guarantee that little was likely to come of the negotiations. An interesting letter from Tweeddale to Lauderdale, dated September 27, 1670, shows the hopelessness of the situation. He explains that he had a private talk with Hutchison and declared "that if this condescension failed of settling & composing differences, which was lik to prove the ultimus conatus, the consequences wold be treubelson to them."⁵¹ Threats of this kind were hardly likely to be helpful, and were quite unworthy of Tweeddale. "What was now proposid & offerid by the Bishops", he continued, "might possibly /

possibly be procurid from his Ma^{tie} to be the settlement of the church in all time coming, and who know bot it might be the beginning of mor favour & indulgens & produs such ane accomodations in the matter of church government as might look nor primativ then any yitt exercisid." ^{52.} "Might possibly be procurid", "might look nor primativ" - phrases such as these made it appear that Tweeddale himself was not altogether convinced. There is, accordingly, little wonder the Presbyterians were thoroughly sceptical. Finally, he pointed out to Hutchison that if the final appeal was to be to the Remonstrators or "senior pars", as they called themselves, the issue was a foregone conclusion - "I an convinoid thes half wittid meetings can produs nothing", he gloomily concluded. ^{53.}

On the date fixed, December 14, 1670, Leighton arrived at Paisley with the Provost of Glasgow, Sir John Harper of Cambusnothan, Mr. Gilbert Burnet, Mr. James Ramsay, Dean of Glasgow, and about twenty-six Presbyterian ministers, indulged and non-indulged, came to confer with them. After prayers by Mr. James Ramsay, Leighton "had a discourse neer an hour's lenth", writes the Rev. John Law to Lady Cardross, "when he asserted most confiden^{tly} episcopacy and cryed down presbiterian government & pressed the accomodation partly with threats and partly with flatteries." ^{54.} Mr. John Baird then made a speech declining "to condescend to sit in judicasteries with a bishop, under whatever name, who is not chosen by these meetings, nor liable to censure from them for malversation, and, so far as he could, retains his negative power, and continues a prelate." ^{55.} A speech followed from /

from Mr. Ralph Rogers in which he asserted that it was impossible to prove that for some hundreds of years there was any bishop in the church who was not chosen by the clergy, and every way accountable to them or that there were any archbishops, with the power they now assume.⁵⁶ The primitive bishops, he said, were chosen by the presbyters and only presided, while the modern ones were imposed upon them. After a denial by Burnet of the primitive bishop's mere presidency⁵⁷ Mr. Alexander Wedderburn rebutted his contentions. Mr. Hutchison contended that the key of doctrine was committed to the presbyters.⁵⁸ Mr. Mathew Ramsay followed, "but Mr. Alex^r. Jamisone did so oppose the bishope that he ran our of the roome and held up his hands, crying 'I see there will be no accomodation.'" ⁵⁹ After some demur Leighton allowed his proposals to be committed to writing. A plea for delay was also admitted but the Presbyterians were told that their decision would be expected at Edinburgh on January 12, 1671. A few days later they met at Kilmarnock and unanimously agreed that the latter proposals were less satisfactory than the former. They drew up their reasons of dissent and nominated Hutchison and others to go to Edinburgh and deliver them, which they did, two conferences being held at Holyrood with the Chancellor, Hamilton, Tweeddale, Leighton, Burnet and the other counsellors on January 11th and 21st. There were also further conferences at the house of Lord Rothes. Regarding the Holyrood Conferences we have Leighton's own narrative which begins with a convenient epitome of his own proposals as offered at Paisley:-

1. That if the Dissenting Brethren will come to Presbyteries and Synods, they shall not only not be obliged to renounce their own private opinion concerning Church Government, or swear or subscribe anything contrary thereto, but shall have liberty at their entry to the said meetings to declare it, and enter it in what form they please.
2. That all Church affairs shall be managed and concluded in Presbyteries and Synods by the free vote of the Presbyters, or the major part of them.
3. If any difference fall out in the Diocesan Synod betwixt any of the members thereof, it shall be lawful to appeal to a Provincial Synod or their committee.
4. That Intrants being lawfully presented by the Patron, and duly tried by the Presbytery, there shall be a day agreed upon by the Bishop and Presbytery for their meeting together for their solemn Ordination and admission, at which there shall be one appointed to preach, and that it shall be at the Parish Church to which they are to be admitted, except in cases of impossibility or extreme inconvenience: and if any difference fall in touching that affair, it shall be referable to the Provincial Synod or their Committee, as any other matter.
5. It is not to be doubted but my Lord Commissioner, his Grace will make good what he offered anent the establishment of Presbyteries and Synods: and we trust his Grace will procure such security to these brethren for declaring their judgment, that they may do it without hazard of contravening any law: and that the Bishop shall humbly and earnestly recommend this to his Grace.
6. That no Intrans shall be obliged to any Canonical oath or subscription to the Bishop; and that his opinion as to that government shall not prejudice him in this, but that it shall be free for him to declare it.

To these proposals, says Leighton, "the short and dry answer" given by the Presbyterians through Mr. Hutchison was - "We are not free in conscience to close with the Propositions made by the Bishop of Dunblane, as satisfactory." ⁶¹ Moreover, says Leighton, having declined these concessions they refused to state what would satisfy /

satisfy them, still less to divulge what they found unsatisfactory in the terms of the accommodation. The strangest thing of all, declares the Bishop, was that they refused at this last meeting to confer in a friendly way on the grounds of their persuasion though they were assured that full appeal would be made to the criterion viz:- the Scriptures, together with the Primitive Church, the Catholic Christian Church in succeeding ages, leading Reformation divines such as Calvin, Luther, Melanchthon, Reformed Churches abroad and lastly, the Presbyterians of England. Indeed, said Leighton, if they could prove their case he would become their proselyte and gladly suffer with them.⁶² Leighton then proceeds to summarize his own and his colleagues' arguments:-

1. There is no scriptural warrant for changing moderators in presbyteries and none against Bishops acting as fixed Presidents in Synods.
2. The fixed Presidency of Bishops in Synods has as much warrant as the fixed moderating in Kirk-Sessions.
3. There is no scripture authority for a parity of presbyters.
- (4. Parity cannot be concluded from Matthew. XX. 26.)
5. If the thing itself be lawful, the appropriating that name of Bishop to the superior presbyter or president cannot make it unlawful, though these two names be indifferently used in the Scripture; for they are so used in some primitive writers at some times, who in other passages do clearly own the different degree of Bishops over Presbyters and were themselves of that degree.
- (6. The strangeness of being offended at the solemn consecration of Bishops.)
7. If there is no direct scripture warrant for the office of a bishop neither is there for Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, National Assemblies, Commission of the Kirk etc.

8. Whether or not bishops had greater power than other presbyters is to be judged by the practice of the Primitive Church, and Canons of the ancient Councils.
9. The late Reformers in France and Germany and the present Reformed Churches abroad, together with the Presbyterians of England hold very moderate opinions regarding Episcopacy and have no sympathy with Scottish Covenanters on the subject. ⁶³

Leighton again refers to the difficulty of the Solemn League and Covenant, and argues, as in his previous letter, that its terms are not against a Moderate Episcopacy. At any rate, surely it is possible to alter it and, if not, what about the clause binding them to uniformity in the churches of the Three Kingdoms? No one, he argues, has any right to identify the Romish Hierarchy of the Covenant with the present Episcopacy. Former Presbyterians did not consider themselves thus obliged to separate from the Synods presided over by Bishops. ⁶⁴

Such is Leighton's account of a movement which can only be described as a noble attempt but an unmitigated failure, although the Bishop consoled himself that it was not altogether unavailing in mitigating the severities of the time.

"Ye late treating and conferences with o^r dissenting brethren seems to have contributed something towards it (the calm in the west), so y^t y^e time and pains bestowed that way seem not to bee wholly lost, and though they cannot be charm'd into union, yet they doe not sting so fiercely as they did, nor does the difference appear so horridly vast, and ye gulf between us so great but that there may be some transition, and diverse of them are speaking of coming to presbyteries, if they may bee excus'd from synods, but 'tis most amongst them y^t that are still out, as indeed most concern'd, & possibly had the rest bin treated with in ye same posture they would have bin more tractable, but we must doe as well as wee can with things as they are, de ce qui est fait, le conseil en est pris." ⁶⁵

So he wrote to Lauderdale. (May, 1672).

M'Hard's criticisms, as given in "The Case of the Accommodation Examined", are worth noting.

1. That a conjunction in the present Church meetings is a certain acknowledgment of and participation with the present ecclesiastical government, which in effect is not truly such, but a mere political constitution wholly dependent upon and resolving in the Supremacy, wherein no faithful minister can take part.
2. That this conjunction doth evidently infer a consent and submission to the Supremacy, and arrant usurpation on the Kingdom and Church of Christ.
3. Such as the present elevation of this all-swaying prerogative, not intended to be suppressed, that all other concessions, though in themselves satisfying, would thereby be deprived of any consistent assurance, and rendered wholly illusory.
4. As the meetings are founded upon and absolutely subjected unto the Supremacy, so they are authorised and ordered by the Archbishops and Bishops, and consequently do in such manner derive their authority from them.
5. The meetings, whereunto we are invited, do consist of such members for their perjurious intrusion and canonical servitude (to say nothing of their more extrinsic delinquencies of profanity, insufficiency and irreligion) as may not only warrant a non-conjunction, but a positive separation.
6. Even in the most moderate acceptation the Bishop, as offered to be reduced, is repugnant both to Scripture, purer antiquity, and our solemn oaths and engagements, inconsistent with the principles of Presbytery, and in effect very little lowered from any of these powers and heights which he acclaims, inasmuch as he is still the King's nomination and not subject to either the censure or control of the meetings over which he doth preside.
7. The accommodation utterly disowns and cuts off the ruling elder.
8. The terms being abjured by the National and the Solemn League and Covenant, to close and comply therewith were to desert the Lord's cause, 'by casting away the word of His patience in this hour of temptation, and to give ourselves to that detestable indifference and neutrality which we have by oath so entirely renounced.'

9. The embracing of this coalition but real suppression of Presbyterian government, would not only be a total surrender of that interest to the will of the adversaries, but engage us into snares, contests, offences and temptations that can be better foreseen than they can be numbered let be prevented.

According to Wodrow a scheme very similar to Leighton's was proposed - a scheme regarding which, however, he can give no details - merely the bare outline. Its tendency, nevertheless, is plain - to change Leighton's scheme in the direction of limiting the power of the bishops and giving power to the Courts of the Church.

1. That Bishops, being reduced to a fixed presidency in Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies, all Church matters be managed, decided and determined by the plurality of the votes of Presbyters convened at the said respective meetings, and that Bishops act nothing neither in ordination nor jurisdiction but by moderating in the said meetings without a negative.
2. That it shall not be in the Bishops' power to refuse to concur in the ordination of any persons lawfully presented by the patrons and duly tried and approved by the Presbytery, and that the ordination be publicly done by the concurrence of the Bishop and Presbytery at the Parish Kirk, and in case the Bishop by some intervening invincible impediment cannot keep the day and hour agreed upon that a new day be appointed, and that as soon as possible can be thereafter for the said ordination, and in case the Bishop shall refuse or delay to concur in the ordination the Lords of His Majesty's Privy Council shall upon complaint of the Patron, Parish, or Presbytery direct letters of horning charging him for that effect.
3. That as General Assemblies, Synods and Presbyteries are raised and quite taken away by Act of Parliament for the restitution of Bishops 1662 and the Act for a National Synod, so they be also revived again by Act of Parliament the indiction of a General Assembly being reserved to the King and the moderating in the Synods to the Bishops, as also in Presbyteries when they are present, and in their absence by other moderators chosen by the Synod.
4. That outed ministers not yet indulged shall enter into charges as freely as they who are indulged.

5. Because many godly ministers cannot be satisfied in their consciences silently to concur with a Bishop or a ~~fixed~~ President in the exercise of government, that it shall be leison to them at their entering into the said Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, and as often thereafter as they shall think fit, to protest.
6. That entrants to the ministry have the same liberty and be free of the oath of canonical obedience.
7. That the oath of allegiance be cleared, and the King's power and supremacy in ecclesiastical matters to be only potestas civilis.
8. And, lastly, because the intervals between the General Assemblies may be long to the effect Bishops may be censurable for their lives and doctrine, that there be a meeting yearly of the whole Bishops with three or more ministers to be chosen by the free votes of the several Synods, who shall have power to depose, suspend and otherwise censure the Bishops, but have no power to meddle in any other ecclesiastical matter.

(Vol. II, pp. 181 and 182. Note.).

On the whole, the movement was a failure. Naturally the question is raised as to the reason.

A primary consideration was the unworthy character of only too many of those who took part in the attempted accommodation. There was the duplicity of Charles himself and the opposition of Lauderdale bent, not on the reconciliation of the country, but its subjection to the Stuart absolutism, a goal which, as the Duke of York admitted, he was wonderfully successful in attaining.⁶⁶ The King's Supremacy in matters ecclesiastical was an impossible barrier. "And as to the power over our Church", wrote Sir George Mackenzie, "it was as absolute here as could be desir'd; the supremacy to us being now equal or greater to that which Henry the 8th took in England."⁶⁷ Lauderdale himself seems to have been of like opinion. The Supremacy Act, he wrote to Charles II. on November

November 16, 1669, "makes you soveraigne in the church, you may now dispose of Bishops & Ministers, and remove & transplant them as you please (which I doubt you can not doe in England). In a word this Church, nor no meeting nor Ecclesiastick Person in it, can ever trouble you more unles you please Never was King soe absolute as you are in poor old Scotland."⁶⁸ Could an accommodation that drew its vitality from such a ruthless and unmitigated absolutism expect any other fate than that which befell it? It is just here where we touch the insuperable difficulty for its acceptation. High and exalted as were the ideals of men like Leighton the movement was placed in an impossible Erastian setting - as M'Ward had observed. Indeed, a unique phrase has been sometimes used to embrace this twofold aspect of the good bishop - "pietistic Erastian."⁶⁹ To him, doubtless, such objections were of little importance, regarding, as he did, disputes on different kinds of church polity as vain and useless. He had himself signed the Covenant and had administered it to others, he had accepted office from Cromwell and, lastly, a bishopric from Charles, so it is no perversity of truth to call him "a thorough-going Erastian."⁷⁰ In a word, said M'Ward, the great objection was that the bishop of the compromise suppressed the presbyter and ruling elder, "and submitted to the wrongous supremacy of the civil ruler."⁷¹ In addition, the omission of any adequate treatment of a National Synod or General Assembly and its possible relation to the bishops was a marked weakness.

It must be admitted, too, that many of the "lordly prelates" had /

had done nothing to conciliate the people to the new order.⁷² Sharp, in particular, had distinguished himself in his opposition to Leighton and his policy. "I can not goe along with the Bishop of Dunblain's concessions", he wrote to Lauderdale, "judging them to leave nothing to the authority of a bishop but the insignificant title."⁷³ "I differ from the new ArchBP", he reiterated in another letter, "as to his proposalls for accomodation, not having the habitude of parting by my own consent with the rights of the Episcopal order, which have been ever acknowledged by the Christian Church."⁷⁴ Burnet is never tired of asserting that the character of the bishops in general was not calculated to win the Scottish people to the Episcopal polity.⁷⁵ As we have already seen, the violence in its reestablishment at the Restoration had alienated many who might otherwise have been more kindly disposed. Both Moray⁷⁶ and Burnet⁷⁷ are agreed that this was the case. "But had this change", says Leighton himself, "bin either a litle lower model'd at first, or at least, as it was, a litle more calmly manag'd, it might likely have attained much better reception and settlement long ere this time: but it was unhappily, and I fear irrecoverably lost, at first setting out, by too high and too hot and hasty counsels."⁷⁸ The truth was that he was the only one among the Bishops who was sincerely in favour of the comprehension⁷⁹ and even he was suspected by some. Burnet speaks as though what was to be conceded in accommodation would easily be regained when Episcopacy was established. Leighton he speaks of as "reckoning that, if the schism could be once healed, and order be once restored, /

restored, it might be easy to bring things into such management, that the concessions then to be offered should do no hurt in present, and should die with that generation."⁸⁰ Hints of this kind were quite sufficient to raise suspicions. Leighton, it must be confessed, sometimes did speak in a way calculated to add colour to them. "I think there is good reason to believe", he once wrote, "that it were not only lawful for these that now govern in this Church, but, if prejudice hindered not, might prove expedient and useful for the good of the Church itself, that they did use in some instances a little more authority than they do, and yet might still be very far off from proud and tyrannical domination."⁸¹ Language like this, well-meant, but incautiously expressed was largely responsible for the usual and ordinary opinion held in Presbyterian circles that the whole accommodation movement was a strategy and a snare. Episcopacy, they thought, was already on the verge of collapse and this was but the signal of distress.⁸² It was but a mere artifice to familiarize the name of prelacy, said Blackadder, which, once tolerated, would gradually recover its authority, to the ultimate extinction of their religion.⁸³ So, too, thought Wodrow, who dubbed it a "cunning and ensnaring proposal."⁸⁴ Behind the movement was a veil of threats - even Leighton and Tweeddale participating - which was largely responsible for stiffening up Covenanting resistance.⁸⁵ To add to Leighton's embarrassment and misfortune, during the very time of the movement, Conventicles increased, and were treated with such severity⁸⁶ that the chances of success faded /

faded into nothingness. How could he be sanguine as to the result when, as he was propounding proposals for peace, Lauderdale was passing a "clanking act" threatening conventicle-preachers with death?

Finally, it is to be remembered that the claim which was made, that the accommodation meant practically a return to the system of 1610, was stoutly denied by the Presbyterians. No longer, it was pointed out, were the bishops merely the presidents of the Church Courts with a negative vote, but had the full government and jurisdiction with both negative and positive votes. In the first Episcopate the presbyteries had been standing legal judicatories but in the second they had been discharged even before the bishops arrived in Scotland and existed merely on the sufferance of the bishops - they were, as the Presbyterians nicknamed them, the "meetings of the Bishops' Committee."⁸⁸ The second Episcopate was merely an Erastian institution, an appendage of the Royal Supremacy, and Leighton's accommodation was part and parcel of the system, and such a verdict, as we have seen, was not without foundation.

XIII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Kirkton's History. p. 176.
2. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 342.
3. Journals of Sir John Lauder. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. xxix.
4. English Church in the Seventeenth Century. C.S. Carter.
p. 110.
5. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 436.
6. Letters from Archibald, Earl of Argyll to John, Duke of
Lauderdale. Bannatyne Club. pp. 62 & 63.
7. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 343 & 344.
See also Dictionary of English Church History. Ollard and
Crosse. pp. 573 & 574.
8. Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Edinburgh 1904.
Vol. II. Burnet-Leighton Papers. 1648-168-. pp. 326,
337, 338.
9. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 507.
10. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 229 & 230.
11. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 189.
12. Narrative of Mr. James Nimmo. Scot. Hist. Socy. p. x.
p. 67.
13. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. pp. 88 & 89.
14. Leighton's Works. Vol. III. p. 231.
15. Do. Vol. II. p. 424.
16. Do. Vol. VII. p. 193.
17. Do. Vol. III. p. 286.
18. Do. Vol. VII. p. 191.
19. Kirkton's History. pp. 360 & 361. Note.
20. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 252.
21. Politics and Religion. Vol. II. p. 228.
22. Sir John Lauder's Historical Notices. p. 177.
23. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 182.
24. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 506.
25. Do. p. 507.
26. Law's Memorials. pp. 29 & 30.
27. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 165.
28. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 529.
Kirkton's History. p. 295.
29. Kirkton's History. p. 295.
30. Do. p. 296.
See also W.M. Hetherington's History of the Church of
Scotland. p. 432.
31. Wodrow. Vol. II. pp. 147, 176 & 177.
32. Diary and general expenditure book of William Cunningham of
Craigends. Edited James Dodds. Scot. Hist. Socy.
p. xxxiv.
33. Kirkton's History. pp. 293 and 294.
See also Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 177.
Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 391 & 392.
Diary of Andrew Hay of Craignethan. Scot. Hist. Socy.
p. 201.

34. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 535.
See also Hetherington's History of the Church of Scotland.
p. 433.
35. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 184.
Law's Memorials. p. 24.
36. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 533, 534 & 536.
Original Papers. Macpherson. p. 56.
37. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 187.
38. Law's Memorials. p. 31.
39. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 531 & 532.
Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 178.
40. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 532.
41. Wodrow says Leighton was most unsatisfactory on this point.
Vol. II. p. 179.
42. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 522 & 523.
43. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 178.
44. Do.
45. Do. pp. 178 & 179.
See also Kirkton's History. p. 297.
46. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 179.
Kirkton's History. p. 297.
47. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 179.
48. Do.
Also Kirkton's History. p. 297.
49. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 179.
Kirkton's History. p. 297.
50. Wodrow. Vol. II. pp. 179 & 180.
51. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 205 & 206.
52. Do.
53. Do.
54. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. III. Appendix. pp. 233 & 234.
55. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 180.
56. Do.
See also Lauderdale Papers. Vol. III. Appendix pp. 233
& 234.
57. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 180.
58. Do.
59. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. III. Appendix. pp. 233 & 234.
60. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII. pp. 207 & 208.
61. Do. p. 208.
62. Do. p. 209.
63. Do. pp. 210, 211 & 212.
64. Do. pp. 212, 213 & 214.
65. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 225 & 226.
66. H.M.C. 3rd Report. 1872. Webster MSS. p. 421.
67. Sir George Mackenzie's Memoirs. p. 139. See also
pp. 138, 159 and 160.
Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 138.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. I. p. 90.
68. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. p. 164.
69. Life of Gilbert Burnet. T.E.S. Clarke and H.C. Foxcroft.
p. 28. See also Miscellany of the Scottish History
Society. Vol. II. p. 315.

70. Life of Gilbert Burnet. T.E.S. Clarke and H.C. Foxcroft.
pp. 88 & 89.
71. See also Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 179.
72. Wodrow. Vol. I. p. 403.
Burnet. Vol. I. p. 339.
73. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 213 & 214.
74. Do. p. 216.
See also Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 532 & 533. 542.
D.N.B. Vol. LI. Article "James Sharp". (T.F. Henderson, .
p. 406.
Miscellany of the Scottish History Society. Vol. I. 1893.
p. 267. Note.
75. Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 207, 279, 283, 239 & 240.
76. Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 49 & 50.
77. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 256.
78. Bannatyne Miscellany. Vol. III. pp. 231 & 232.
79. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 502.
80. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 503.
81. Leighton's Works. Vol. VII. p. 191.
82. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 536.
83. Blackadder's Memoirs. Andrew Crichton. p. 152.
See also Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 508, 532 & 533.
84. Wodrow. Vol. II. pp. 146, 177 & 183.
85. Wodrow. Vol. II. p. 180.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. pp. 208, 209 & 207.
Lauderdale Papers. Vol. III. pp. 233 & 234.
Burnet. Vol. I. pp. 539 & 540.
86. Burnet. Vol. I. p. 508.
87. Kirkton's History. p. 298.
88. Do. pp. 141 & 142.

XIV.

ACCOMMODATION and the REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT.

After Leighton's day the word accommodation was under a cloud - which, of course, was not surprising in years which included the "Killing Times." All the same, it had not entirely disappeared but was to be heard of again in the Revolution Settlement. We, therefore, fittingly conclude our Scottish study with some references to this period.

Church divisions, admittedly, were more prevalent than ever - the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of Scotland, indulged ministers in charge of parishes, outed ministers refusing the benefits of the Acts of Indulgence, ministers who had resigned in 1681 because of the Test Act - and Cameronians.

A call there was for accommodation under the new regime and to some, at least, the time seemed propitious. As between Episcopalians and Presbyterians differences in ritual were slight¹ - which reminds us of Leighton's day. No doubt Lord Tarbet could say in 1689 "Episcopacy appears unsufferable to a great party and Presbytery as odious to others"² but that did not discourage the mediating party. Representatives of both polities presented their case to the new administration - Bishop Rose looking after the interest of the Scottish Bishops. He was not, he tells us in a letter, without his hopes -

"He (William of Orange) had the Presbyterians sure on his side, both from inclination and interest, many of them having come over with him, and the rest of them having approved /

approved so warmly that with no good grace imaginable could they return to King James' interest; next by gaining us he might presume to gain the Episcopal nobility and gentry, which he saw was a great party, and consequently King James would be deprived of his principal support; then he saw what a hardship it would be upon the Church of England, and of what bad consequence, to see Episcopacy ruined in Scotland, who, no doubt, would have vigorously interfered for us if we by our carriage could have been brought to justify their measures." ³

Principal Carstairs in his "Hints for the King" epitomized the arguments on the other side -

1. That the Episcopal party in Scotland was generally disaffected to the Revolution and enemies to the principles on which it was conducted, while the Presbyterians were almost for a man declared for it, and were, moreover, the great body of the people. None, therefore, could think it strange that the friends of a government could enjoy all the encouragement it can afford whilst it withheld its countenance from open enemies.
2. That the Episcopal clergy in Scotland, especially the prelates, had been so accustomed to warp their religious tenets with the political doctrines of royal supremacy, passive obedience, and non-resistance, it became inconsistent with the very end of his coming to continue Episcopacy on its present footing in Scotland.
3. That as it was impossible for his Majesty to show that favour to the Nonconformists in England who were a numerous body, and at the same time zealously attached to Revolution Principles, which he was naturally disposed to do because such conduct would awaken the jealousy of the Church of England, here was an opportunity of effectually demonstrating to them that the discouragements they might labour under during his administration were not owing to any prejudice he entertained against them, but to the necessity of the times and the delicate situation in which he was placed. ⁴

Put thus bluntly there seemed little ground for compromise between the two. Moreover, as William had no conscientious convictions regarding the divine right of any form of church government /

government. - a fact known to both Rose and Carstairs - the issue seemed open to a settlement on grounds of expediency. As, however, the Bishops adhered to the cause of King James Presbyterianism seemed to be the better placed. Plain this was when the Convention of lords and clergy and nobility and of the commissioners of shires and burghs met on 14th March.⁵ The Convention of the 12th April adopted a declaration which included an offer of the Crown of Scotland to King William and Queen Mary, containing also the claim of right which began -

"As our ancestors have usually done for the vindication and asserting of their ancient rights and liberties we declare"

Among the declarations which follow is this -

"That prelacy or the superiority of office in the Church above Presbyter is and hath been an intolerable grievance and hostile to this nation and contrary to the inclination of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation (they having been reformed by Presbyters), and therefore ought to be abolished."

This statement has been often repeated but it has also been widely disputed. "Contrary to the inclination of the generality of the people." Could this be proved? The Presbyterian Carlyle of Inveresk declares that "more than two-thirds of the people of the country, and most of the gentry, were Episcopal", in 1689 and later. General Mackay, a zealous Presbyterian, wrote in 1690 - "Let men flatter themselves as they will I tell you who know Scotland, and where the strength and weakness of it doth lie, that if I were as much an enemy to that interest (Presbyterianism) as I am a friend, I would without difficulty engage to form in Scotland a more /

more formidable party against it, even for their majesties' government, than can be formed for it." There is a good deal of evidence to the same effect.

On July 21 the Scottish Parliament - the Convention changed by royal command to a Parliament - passed an act abolishing Prelacy. It began with a preamble repeating the declaration of the claim of right regarding Prelacy and declared that their Majesties with the consent and advice of Parliament would settle the form of government most agreeable to the people.

Before this Act was passed the following petition addressed to the Duke of Hamilton, his Majesty's High Commissioner, and to the High Court of Parliament, was given in by the Earl of Kintore in the name of the 'conform ministers' of the Synod of Aberdeen.

"The petition of Mr. James Gordon, minister at Banchory, and Mr. James Barclay, minister at Crowden, humbly sheweth that the petitioners having received a commission from the ministers within the Diocese of Aberdeen to repair to this place, and by a humble address to lay before your Grace and the honourable Estate of Parliament the deep sense which they have of the sad and dejected state of the National Church, and to supplicate that some effectual remedy may be applied. It is most humbly represented that the ministers of the aforesaid Diocese did give in these late times a free testimony against Popery, and have now generally concurred in rendering thanks to the Divine Majesty for granting so seasonable a stop to the designs of the anti-Christian party, and in praying for his present Majesty as the King William as the great instrument of this deliverance. So they are earnestly desirous of a union with all their Protestant brethren who differ only from them in methods of Church government, not doubting but that if both sides would mutually lay aside their unchristian heat and animosity they might be reconciled as to serve their Lord with one mind, and to tolerate one another in the things in which they may still differ. And seeing it hath been heretofore the practice of all Christian Churches to meet in National Synods for rectifying disorders, removing scandals, and healing any breaches as has at any time arisen therein. And that now a hearty agreement among Protestants and a joining /

joining against the common enemy seems to be more than ever needful when so great designs are forming against them, and when we have to do with so powerful and implacable governments. Therefore, if this may be acceptable and reasonable, your petitioners for themselves and in the name of their brethren for whom they are deputed do offer their humble supplications to your Grace as his Majesty's High Commissioner, and to the High Court of Parliament, that a free and full General Assembly which they have now for a long time wished to obtain when and where his Majesty, with the advice of the Estate of Parliament, shall think fit. And in order to the progress and guidance of the General Assembly towards so great and good a design they humbly move, if it may seem good, that previously some learned and moderate men of the different persuasions in relation to Church government may be appointed to meet and to prepare overtures of an accommodation such as may tend to the unity and peace of the Church - to which the ministers of the foresaid Diocese will give their hearty concurrence, and they will show how sincerely they desire that the terms of communion among Protestants may not be straightened, and that nothing may be imposed which may be hurtful to the conscience of any of the ministers or bring any disagreeable reflection on their holy calling, and your petitioners have reason to hope that this humble offer being favourably considered and accepted may by the blessing of God, be a means of preserving the Protestant interest in this kingdom." ⁶

This is indeed a most interesting petition. It can only be regretted that the majority of the members of Parliament did not see their way to agree with the Duke of Hamilton in his desire to receive it. Doubtless the Presbyterians feared that in a General Assembly they would be outnumbered. The precedent of 1660, of asking a change in the church government without consulting the General Assembly, was followed.

A draft of an overture presented to this Parliament by the King's Commissioner is preserved in the Carstairs' State Papers a draft which is of great interest in our study. It declared that Presbytery after the form of that appointed by Parliament in 1592 was most agreeable to the people, and that therefore this was /

was to be the government of the Church. It ordered that Presbyteries should admit ministers presented by lawful patrons. It ordered that all ministers should conform to this form of Church government and take the oath of allegiance, and it restored the ministers who were deprived or resigned in 1661 and 1681. It restricted the power of the Church to the preaching of the Word, the infliction of ecclesiastical censure and the administration of the Sacraments. It gave permission for General Assemblies only when called by the King, and it gave power to the King to send commissioners to Synods and Presbyteries to see that his commands were not disobeyed.

There was certainly hope here for the accommodationists. On 25th April 1690 Parliament abolished the Assertory Act which had given the King power to remove Bishops and other ministers without any trial, and on 26th May the Westminster Confession of Faith was ratified. On the 7th June the Act was passed which fixed the constitution of the Church of Scotland. It ratified the Confession of Faith and established the government of the Church as fixed in the Act of 1592, with the exception of patronage which was left for further consideration.

It is interesting to note how this Act differed from the Draft Act of the previous year. This latter proposed to leave all ministers in the exercise of their functions who were willing to conform to the new government of the Church and take the oath of allegiance - a plan which would have made possible a scheme of comprehension. It was not to be so as the former placed the government /

government in the hands of the ministers who had been outed for want of conformity to Episcopacy, and those whom they might associate with them. We may be forced to admit that it was inevitable yet undoubtedly King William was grieved that his comprehension scheme was effectively debarred. A memorandum of his shows he objected to placing the power in the hands of the outed ministers and wished to allow all ministers to take part in the government of the Church who promised to submit to the Presbyterian form of Church government. Alas, it was not to be. Episcopacy was deemed out of the question, the Solemn League and Covenant, too, was to be avoided - so it was natural to fall back on the Act of 1592 - an Erastian Act - and Erastianism, as we have seen, was no friend of the Accommodation Movement. As at the Restoration the golden opportunity was lost.

Nevertheless, that many thought along lines of comprehension is shown by Lord Tarbet's scheme of "concurrent endowment."⁷ He proposed that all ministers excluded from their parish for public differences should be restored to their parishes unless objected to by the heritors, in which case they were to be provided for in some other way. He further proposed that both Presbyterians and Episcopalians should meet in Presbyteries and Synods of their own, the Episcopalians having power to elect permanent moderators, and the Presbyterians to have power to change their moderators. The constant moderators were to be paid provided there were not more than one for each Diocese at the rate of £1000 Scots south of the Tay and £800 Scots north of the Tay. Both parties were to be allowed /

allowed to hold General Assemblies, but only by permission of the King. Neither party was to interfere with the discipline exercised by the other. Both were to be enjoined not to preach against the model of the other, and to entertain towards one another Christian charity and communion.

This idealistic dual system - interesting as coming from an Episcopalian - was, of course, impracticable but shows to what length a layman was ready and willing to go.

The General Assembly met on the 16th of October, 1690 - the first time for thirty-eight years. To it the King sent a letter in which he said, "Moderation is what your religion enjoins, what neighbouring churches expect from you, and what I recommend."⁸ Nevertheless, the two Commissions appointed for the visiting of parishes depleted the church to an extent not known either in 1661 or later in 1843. The King desired to see the vacant parishes filled, and to restore peace by the admission of as many deprived ministers as desired to conform and take the oath of allegiance. When the Assembly met in 1692 it was urged both in the King's letter and in the speech of his Commissioner that it should be made as easy as possible for ministers who had conformed to Episcopacy to act as ministers of the Church. The King suggested that all should be allowed to come in who would sign this formula - "I do solemnly declare and promise that I will submit to the Presbyterian Government of the Church as it is now established in this kingdom under their Majesties King William and Queen Mary in Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, and that I will as becomes /

becomes a minister of the Gospel heartily concur with the said Government for the suppression of sin and wickedness, the promotion of piety, and the purging of the Church of all erroneous and scandalous ministers."

Before this Assembly met a petition from Episcopal clergy was lodged, addressed to his Grace, their Majesties' Commissioner, and the General Assembly met in Edinburgh. It was as follows -

"Humbly sheweth that since Episcopacy is abolished and Presbyterian Government established by Act of Parliament as it was established in 1592, and we being desirous to exercise the Holy Function wherewith we are invested in our several stations for the glory of God, the advancement of religion, their Majesties' service, and the peace of the nation. We therefore humbly desire that all steps and impediments may be taken off so that we may be permitted to act as Presbyters in Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies in the Government of the Church as by law established."

Apparently this was the result of meetings at Aberdeen - and at the suggestion of the King.¹⁰ The Assembly, however, was anything but cordial and nothing came of it. An "Act for the quiet and peace of the Church" was passed in 1693, an act which imposed for ministers a formula more stringent than the one which King William proposed that the General Assembly of 1692 should enact. This, it is said, was to please the Presbyterians who feared the possibility of an Episcopalian majority.

After 1694 the King apparently regarded the return of the great body of the Episcopal ministers as hopeless. He never ceased, however, to hanker after his comprehensive ideals. In 1695, indeed, an Act was passed allowing Episcopal ministers to remain in the charge of parishes without signing the formula, on condition /

condition that they took no part in the government of the Church. The policy of leniency, too, was carried a stage further by the General Assemblies of 1694, 1697 and 1698 which instructed Presbyteries to be "very delicate in their proceedings with any of the late conformed ministers in order to their reception into the government on terms of the acknowledgment settled by the Assembly 1694."

In addition, Carlyle of Inveresk can be invoked as a witness to the effect that the policy was continued well into the eighteenth century. Indeed, a comprehension of a sort - assuredly not loudly assertive but at least tolerated - existed and contributed in no small degree to the peace and outward unity enjoyed in Scottish church affairs from the time of the Revolution Settlement.

XIV. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Oldmixon: Memoirs of North Britain, London, 1715. p. 82.
Old Scottish Communion Plate. Thomas Burns, D.D.
p. 84 seq.
2. Leven and Melville Papers. p. 125.
3. Bishop Keith's Register. p. 65.
4. Carstairs' State Papers. p. 39.
5. Minutes of Convention.
6. Paper in the Library of the Scottish Episcopal College,
Edinburgh.
7. Leven and Melville Papers.
8. Minutes of General Assembly, 1690.
9. Episcopal Innocence by William Lauk. London. 1694. p. 2.
10. Grub. Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Vol. III.
p. 330.

PART II.

ENGLAND.

XV.

EARLY ENGLISH PRESBYTERIANISM.

We now come to the study of accommodation movements in England. In that land - be it confessed - the position was not quite the same as in Scotland. In the latter the struggle of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism was long and sustained, the issue being continually in doubt. It was necessary, therefore, to examine Scottish ecclesiastical history in some detail to ascertain the chances of a moderate Episcopacy and the extent to which accommodation was feasible. In England the situation was different, it not being possible honestly to argue that at any time was it likely that Presbyterianism would become, willingly, at least, on the part of the generality of the people, the permanent polity of the National Church. Episcopacy was in situ. Nevertheless, Presbyterianism in England had an honourable history, grew from small beginnings to an extent that it had to be reckoned with and was able, at least for a period, dubbed by some "anarchical",¹ to be the legal form of church government in England. Accommodation, therefore, was widely studied and repeatedly attempted, tentatively in the first half of the seventeenth century and most determinedly in the second. The movement, too, was graced with great names and - as we shall see later - by the sustained thought of some of the finest English thinkers.

It does not, of course, fall within the scope of our subject to trace the rise of Presbyterianism in England, though the story is /

is entrancing enough. It would take us to Martin Bucer and his Presbyterianizing Draft of Church Reform for Edward VI., 1549-1551, to John A'Lasco and his Presbyterian Organization of the London Church of the Strangers, 1550-1553, to John Hooper and his controversies, and, of course, to John Knox himself and his wide influence. The growth of Presbyterian views among the English exiles, too, especially at Frankfort and Geneva could not very well be omitted - a great inceptive period, a period that was followed by a more formative one.

Certainly Queen Elizabeth's policy was temporizing. As a Tudor she loved authority, while her reforming zeal seemed, at least, more apparent abroad than at home. Indeed, her ideal was evidently a semi-Reformed English Institution, with a partially Roman ritual and doctrine, subject to herself.

Says Neal -

"It is evident that the parliament, the people, and great numbers of the inferior clergy, were for carrying the Reformation farther than the present establishment. The first bishops came into it with this view; they declared against the Popish habits and ceremonies, and promised to use all their interest with the queen for their removal; but how soon they forgot themselves, when they were warm in their chairs, the foregoing history has discovered."²

Parliament it was that was more Protestant than the Queen, more Protestant, too, than the Church dignitaries themselves, a political hand that effected a change - as witness the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity³ - the one abolishing all ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction, except as granted by the Crown and the other prohibiting all changes of rites, discipline and /

and worship without the approbation of Parliament. The ensuing policy of Episcopacy coercion had its results - we now hear of the early seceding Presbyterian Puritans.⁴ No doubt the great bulk of the Presbyterianizing party wished to maintain a foothold in the established church, it being well to note, however - having in view future accommodation prospects - that, while impressed by Elizabeth's rather capricious authoritarianism, they ceased not to look forward to a time when she would follow, as aforetime, in the wake of Edward VI.

It is well to note, too, that there was a seed of Presbyterianism within the church itself. In the Zurich Letters,⁵ for example, we find Bishop Sandys of Worcester writing to Bullinger (1570) and giving us the evidence.

He says -

"New orators are rising up from among us - foolish young men who despise authority and admit of no superior. They are seeking the complete overthrow and uprooting of the whole of our ecclesiastical polity, and striving to shape out for us I know not what new platform of a Church That you may be the better acquainted with the whole matter, accept this summary of the question at issue, reduced under certain heads:-

- I. The civil magistrate has no authority in ecclesiastical matters; he is only a member of the Church, the government of which ought to be committed to the clergy.
- II. The Church of Christ admits of no other government but that by Presbyteries, viz. by the minister, elders and deacons.
- III. The names and authorities of Archbishops, Archdeacons, Deans, Chancellors, Commissaries, and other titles and dignities of like kind, should be altogether removed from the Church of Christ.
- IV. Each parish should have its own Presbytery.

- V. The choice of ministers of necessity belongs to the people.
- VI. The goods, possessions, lands, revenues, titles, honours, authorities and all other things relating either to bishops or cathedrals, and which now of right belong to them, should be taken away forthwith and for ever.
- VII. No one should be allowed to preach who is not a pastor of some congregation; and he ought to preach to his own flock exclusively, and nowhere else.
- VIII. The infants of Papists are not to be baptized.
- IX. The judicial laws of Moses are binding upon Christian princes, and they ought not in the slightest degree to depart from them."

On the other hand - and in the interest of our subject of accommodations - it is apposite to note that the Puritans were not averse to Episcopacy.

Says Neal -

"They were no enemies to the name or function of a bishop, provided he was no more than πρεσβυτερος, or a stated precedent of the college of presbyters in his diocess, and managed the affairs of it with their concurrence and assistance. They did not object against prescribed forms of prayer, provided a latitude was indulged the minister to alter or vary some expressions; and to make use of a prayer or his own conception before and after sermon: nor had they an aversion to any decent and distinct habits for the clergy that were not derived from Popery. But upon the whole they were the most resolute Protestants in the nation, zealous Calvinists, warm and affectionate preachers, and determined enemies to Popery, and to every thing that had a tendency towards it." (History of the Puritans. Vol. I. pp. 466 and 467).

And now some mention must be made of Thomas Cartwright, the acknowledged Presbyterian leader. No concern it is of ours, of course, to narrate his career but merely to speak of his name as relative to our subject. From his time it was that Presbytero-Puritanism became a living force.

His views are epitomized in six carefully written articles ⁶.

- I. The names of Archbishops and Archdeacons, with their functions, ought to be abolished.
- II. The offices of the lawful ministers in the Church, such as those of Bishops and Deacons described in Scripture, ought to be recalled to Apostolic usage; the Bishop to be engaged in the Ministry of the Word and prayer, and the Deacon in having care of the poor.
- III. The Government of the Church should not be in the hands of Bishops' Chancellors, or Archidiaconal officials; but every Church should be governed by its own Minister and Presbytery or body of Elders.
- IV. Ministers should not be wanderers at large, but each should have care of some particular flock.
- V. No one should seek the ministerial office, like a soliciting candidate.
- VI. Ministers ought not to be made and appointed by the sole authority of the Bishops; much less in a study or other private place; but there ought to be an election made by the Church. Every one should labour according to his calling, to secure these needful reforms: the Magistrate striving by his authority, the Minister by the word, and all by their prayers and otherwise.

These propositions were to many alarming enough - yet they were in no sense to be feared by any moderate or primitive Episcopacy - only by the prelatie form. Surely this is an interesting parallel to Leighton's argument, in speaking of the terms of the Solemn League and Covenant, that a prelatie Episcopacy alone was threatened.

A further step in the Presbyterian evolution was the First Admonition to Parliament - published anonymously in 1572, admitted, however, to be the work of John Field, in conjunction with Thomas Wilcocks. The subjects dealt with were the clergy, the /

the prayer book and liturgy and, finally, government and polity. Raising men to "livings and offices, by anti-Christ devised, but in Christ's Word forbidden, as Metropolitan, Archbishop, Lord's Grace, Lord Bishop, Suffragan, Dean. Archdeacon, Prelate of the Garter, Earl, Count Palatine, Honour, High Commissioner, Justice of the Peace" was adversely criticised - all of these being drawn, not out of Scripture, but "out of the Pope's shop." Ministers should be called by the congregation, not thrust upon them by the bishop, or ordained without a title and should be admitted to his function by the laying on of the hands of the eldership only. In every congregation there was to be "a lawful and godly seigniory," and that order which Christ left by His Apostles, and which the Primitive Church used, "the regiment of ministers, seniors, and deacons jointly."

(See Puritan Manifestoes. W.H. Frere and C.E. Douglas. pp. 8-55).

Such an Admonition caused no small sensation - the reply to it by Whitgift in 1573 calling forth a Second Admonition, admittedly from the pen of Thomas Cartwright. The statutes should be repealed, it stated, that made the ministry partly to consist of lords spiritual, making one minister higher than another. Christ forbade primacy and dominion. He suggested a series of conferences.

"A conference I call the meeting of some certain ministers and other brethren to confer and exercise themselves in prophesying or interpreting the Scriptures. At which conferences any one or any certain of the brethren are at the order of the whole to be employed upon some affairs of the Church; and where the demeanours of the ministers may be examined and rebuked."

So the definition ran.

He further suggested the setting up of a synod provincial, that is, a meeting of certain of the consistory of every parish within a province, where great causes of the churches which could not be ended in their own consistories or conferences should be heard and determined. From a provincial synod there might be an appeal to a national synod; and from this again to a more general synod of all churches. He then dealt with the local consistory in every congregation, consisting of the ministers and elders, or assistants whom the parish should consent upon and choose, and upon whom, when chosen, the minister should lay his hands to testify to them their admission. The consistory had the power of rebuke and even of excommunication. They should send representatives to a provincial or national council. In conclusion, the Admonition appealed to the Queen, the council, the nobility and the commons to procure a free conference on the matter.

These two Admonitions were of no small importance and interest, giving us, as they do, an epitome of the Puritan position. True, the Queen did not respond - on the other hand, the voluntary associations, a characteristic of this period, did much to prepare the minds of the people to look with favour on the Puritan discipline - as also did the "Prophecyings" - prophecyings or exercises, as they were sometimes called, the real parents of classical Presbytery. Both of these, however, giving scope to discussion on church government, Elizabeth's wrath and opposition were assured, as well as Grindal's fall made inevitable - which brings /

brings us to the period so well described by Thomas Fuller as "Presbytery in Episcopacy".

There was no intention of separating from the Church. Rather was it to bring about such changes as would make its government conform more nearly to what they regarded as the Scriptural idea. The object was to substitute a government of pastors and ruling elders for that of archbishops and bishops, chancellors and archdeacons; and also to organize the parishes of England into a connected system of presbyteries, synods and assemblies provincial and general.

In 1574 appeared one of the most memorable books on the Puritan side - Travers' 'Ecclesiasticae Disciplinae et Anglicanae Ecclesiae . . . explicatio' which added greatly to the discussion. (Originally in two forms, Latin and English, a second edition of the English translation was printed in Geneva in 1580). The author's purpose was to discuss the proper calling, conduct, knowledge, apparel and maintenance of a minister of religion; the offices of the doctor or teacher, the bishops, pastors and elders, and also the functions of the consistory. What was needed, it was argued, was a new reformation dealing with the discipline of the Church, the first thing to be done being to make a clean sweep of the Canon Law out of which had come archbishops, lord bishops, chancellors, archdeacons and the like, by whom the Church had been taken and enslaved. This accomplished, then the true and right discipline was to be established, based upon the one essential principle of Puritanism which is that the Word of God is the authority, /

authority, and that nothing could be admitted save what was confirmed by the voice and witness of God Himself.

In 1572 a congregation after the Presbyterian model was set up at Wandsworth.⁷ Some fifteen ministers from London and from the neighbourhood of Wandsworth were the leaders of this movement, there being associated with them a considerable number of influential laymen. At their meeting on the 20th of November eleven elders, or presbyters, were chosen and their orders described as 'the Orders of Wandsworth'. This organization can hardly be described as the first Presbyterian church in England - rather was it an association within the borders of the established Church - a society of the more spiritually-minded people, an ecclesiola in ecclesia, consisting of those who desired a purer communion, who combined together for a higher fellowship and discipline than obtained in the status quo. It is spoken of by Dr. L. Elliott-Binns as a "shadow" church, presumably intended to be ready for the day when, by means of Parliament, Presbyterianism should become the established form of Christianity in England.⁸

At Cockfield in Suffolk an important meeting was held when sixty ministers from Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire came together in conference, to determine what in the use of the Prayer Book might be tolerated and what refused. This meeting stood adjourned to Cambridge at the next Commencement, and afterwards from thence to London. The result of these three synodical gatherings was embodied in certain conclusions, formally drawn up by Cartwright and Travers, the object of which was the introduction /

introduction of important changes in the organization and worship of the National Church which should yet not mean separation from that Church.

For our study the conclusions were most important - churches were to be arranged in classical, provincial and national synods; ministers should be called to the pastorate, first of all, by the churches they were to serve, and this call be approved by the local classic meeting in conference; and then the minister, so called and so approved should by letters be commended to the bishop for ordination. Church-wardens and collectors for the poor could be turned into elders and deacons without disturbing the present arrangement. Extensions were resolved upon. For example, the shire of Northampton was arranged in three separate classes, held in the towns of Northampton, Daventry and Kettering. A provincial synod of these classes was also convened in the town of Northampton and similar gatherings held in other counties, especially Warwickshire, Suffolk, Norfolk and Essex. An order was made that the results arrived at in these conferences should be reported to the greater assemblies held in Cambridge at the time of the Sturbridge Fair of 1567, and in London at the time of the Bartholomew Fair - when large gatherings would be less noticeable. Reports were also to be sent up to a synod held at St. John's College, Cambridge, at the Sturbridge Fair time of 1589. On this occasion Travers' Discipline, after further revision and correction was subscribed to by the members present as essential and necessary for all time.

The policy of Presbytery in Episcopacy was indeed business-like for, at the Northamptonshire Assembly, an Ecclesiastical Survey of the churches of the county was ordered to be made and a return sent in of the value of each benefice and of the population of the parish, giving also the name of the incumbent and a description of his personal character and ministry. It was also resolved to obtain, if possible, a more extended, a national, survey of churches for parliamentary purposes, and to arrange for representatives to be sent up to London when Parliament was in session.

From now on the 'classes' system grew by natural evolution, the parochial Presbyteries of the Wandsworth type being the general pattern - an evolution which, be it said, synchronized with the growth and final publication of the Great Directory, or Book of Discipline of 1583, "the palladium of English Presbyterianism"⁹ - partly modelled on the Scottish Book of Discipline composed twenty years before by Knox and his colleagues - which gave the detailed scheme of church government. True, undoubtedly, is W.H. Frere's dictum - "The Admonitions had given the movement heart, the Book of Discipline had given it method."¹⁰

And now, having learned something of English Presbyterianism and its state towards the end of the sixteenth century, we are ready to study the accommodation movements of the seventeenth.

XV. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Dictionary of English Church History. Ollard and Crosse.
p. 393.
 2. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. I. p. 465.
 3. Documents illustrative of English Church History.
Gee and Hardy. pp. 442 and 458.
 4. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. I. p. 187 seq.
 5. Zurich Letters. I. pp. 294 & 295.
 6. Strype's Whitgift. Appendix. ix. iii. 20.
 7. A contemporary but biassed account is given in Bancroft's
Dangerous Positions and Proceedings . . . for the
Presbyterial Discipline.
 8. L. Elliott-Binns. The Reformation in England.
pp. 163 & 164.
- of. W.H. Frere.
"Secession from the historic organisation of
the Church was still to the nonconformists
an impossible expedient."
History of the English Church in the reigns
of Elizabeth and James I. p. 126.
- Neal, too, says -
"The design of these conclusions was to
introduce a reformation into the church
without a separation."
History of the Puritans. Vol. I. p. 279.
Neal's account is given in Vol. I. p. 278
seq.
9. Elizabethan Religious History. Henry Soames, M.A.
p. 352.
 10. W.H. Frere. History. p. 225.
 11. "About 1590 there were some 500 Presbyterian ministers
in England."
John Dall. Article "Presbyterianism."
E.R.E. Vol. X. p. 252.

XVI.

THE HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE
and REYNOLDS' ACCOMMODATION.

The accession of James VI. of Scotland to the throne of England might conceivably have brought the word accommodation to the forefront again, all parties, both in church and state, vying with one another in conveying the first words of congratulation and all expecting no small concessions for themselves. Many incidents, however, had led the English Presbyterians to believe that he would be kindly disposed to them. The Episcopalians, too, were encouraged by recent ecclesiastical developments in Scotland, while the Roman Catholics hoped that the son of Mary Stuart would not be forgetful of them. In particular, the Puritans addressed many petitions - the most important, of course, being the Millenary petition of April 1603, conciliatory in tone - and 'presented', says Dr. G.M. Trevelyan, 'in the hope that the doubtful toleration afforded them within the Elizabethan establishment might under the new regime be changed for a secure and legalised comprehension.' (England under the Stuarts. p. 77.).

It ran -

"Seeing it has pleased the Divine majesty, to the great comfort of all good Christians, to advance your highness, according to your just title, to the peaceable government of this Church and Commonwealth of England, we, the ministers of the gospel in this land, neither as factious men affecting a popular parity in the Church, nor as schismatics aiming at the dissolution of the State ecclesiastical, but as the faithful servants of Christ and loyal subjects to your majesty, /

majesty, desiring and longing for the redress of divers abuses of the Church, could do no less in our obedience to God, service to your majesty, love to His Church, than acquaint your princely majesty with our particular griefs."²

The disclaiming of being either factious or schismatic was certainly helpful for possible negotiations. How different was the mood from that of thirty years before, when the abolition of the episcopate was so haughtily demanded! The conformist spirit of Puritanism, assuredly, boded well for schemes of comprehension. The petition continued -

"These, with such other abuses yet remaining and practised in the Church of England, we are able to show not to be agreeable to the Scriptures, if it shall please your highness further to hear us, or more at large by writing to be informed, or by conference among the learned to be resolved; and yet we doubt not but that, without any further process, your majesty (of whose Christian judgment we have received so good a taste already) is able of yourself to judge of the equity of this cause. God, we trust, has appointed your highness our physician to heal these diseases."³

Other petitions, too, of a definitely Presbyterian nature were added to this⁴ so that the deep desire of, and willingness to participate in, a conference became more and more apparent. The time, indeed, was opportune and, had the conference only been carried out honestly and fairly, much positive and practical work might have been achieved. Yet, James, into whose character we have already looked,⁵ was hardly the person to guarantee its success. The subsequent Hampton Court Conference, called in the summer of 1603, lasted nominally three days, Saturday 14th, Monday 16th, and Wednesday, 18th January, 1604. We are only interested in it, however, to the extent it affects our subject, it not being necessary for us to narrate its proceedings.

In December the Puritan ministers held a conference in or near London to decide on their demands. The moderates defeated the radicals who wished to 'modify' Episcopacy sufficiently to make it practically Presbyterianism and pledged the speakers to ask simply for the reform of abuses and minor matters. The bishops spent the autumn preparing their case. On 14th January 1604, the first day of the conference, the bishops were alone with the King, and were really forced to defend themselves. They agreed to reform many abuses. On the second day, 16th January, the majority of the bishops in committee drew up in form the points concluded at the first day's debate with the King, while Bishops Bancroft and Bilson, aided by several deans, debated the question of reform with four Puritans - Reynolds, Sparke, Chaderton and Knewstubbs.

These are interesting names. The natural leader was Reynolds. A fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford (1566-1586) he was famous as Greek reader for his lectures on Aristotle. Dean of Lincoln (1593-1598), he was President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford (1598-1607). Among the most learned men of England ("His memory", says Fuller, "was little less than miraculous, he himself being the truest table to the multitude of voluminous books he had read over".), he was an exponent of modified Episcopacy, the *via media*, a member of the school of Ussher and Leighton - an interesting fact in our present enquiry. Sparke was the author of "A Brotherly Persuasion to Unity and Uniformity", while Knewstubbs was the most pronouncedly Presbyterian of the group.

Reynolds demanded purity of doctrine, an able clergy, the government of the church 'sincerely ministered according to God's word', the correction of the errors in the Book of Common Prayer and the amendment of the Thirty-nine Articles. Bancroft argued that what they really asked was the adoption of the full Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, thus abandoning the position the English church had always held. The change in confirmation, too, was meant to place in the hands of the ordinary clergy the right to confirm, and hence the right to admit, new members to the church. Further, to declare that the minister's intention was not of the essence of the Eucharist, as Reynolds asked, was to permit the Puritan clergy to administer to their flocks a sacrament which they did not believe was a sacrament, which, however, they must perform in order legally to hold their cures.

Eventually Reynolds brought forth the radical proposals and asked for the modification of Episcopacy. He requested that the bishops and archdeacons should share their functions with a council of learned ministers. The archdeacon's visitation would thus become a classis, the bishop's a provincial, and the archbishop's a national synod.

"First, in rural deaneries, and therein to have prophesying, according as the reverend father Arch-bishop Grindall, and other bishops desired of her late majesty. Secondly, that such things as could not be resolved upon there, might be referred to the archdeacon's visitation, and so Thirdly, from thence to the episcopal synode, where the bishop with his presbytery should determine all such points as before could not be decided." ^b

Hence, without changing the law of the English Church, the substance /

substance of the true church government instituted by Christ could be introduced. James, who had had too much experience - so he thought - of Scottish Presbyterianism not to see the meaning of the proposal, told Reynolds he would never grant it till he was 'pursy and fat'. If that was all the Puritans had to say he saw no crying need for reform. They must conform or he would 'harry them out of the land'.

Reynolds' accommodation was, accordingly, ruled out, the Presbyterians clearly seeing what lay before them - an unenviable era. James' thoughts, assuredly, were in keeping with those of Archbishop Hutton received some time before -

"Whether is better, the Bishops to continue in England, or that Presbyteries be brought into this realm and Church of England?"

"Therefore the king's majesty, as he is a passing wise king, and the best learned prince in Europe, had need to take heed, how he receiveth into his kingdom such a popular government ecclesiastical as is that of the presbyterie."

These words, surely, James remembered at the conference itself when Reynolds expounded his accommodation.

"At which speech his Majesty was somewhat stirred; yet, which is admirable in him, without passion, or shew thereof; thinking that they aymed at a Scottish presbytery, which, saith he, as well agreeth with a monarchy as God and the Devil. Then Jack, and Tom and Will, and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me and my counsel, and all our proceedings: then Will shall stand up and say, It must be thus; then Dick shall reply and say, Nay marry, but we will have it thus. And therefore, here I must once reiterate my former speech, Le Roy s'avisera."

If the National Church was to be the Church of all English Protestants it would require to be comprehensive - a fact not as yet fully recognized, Bacon being one of the few who saw the truth. /

truth. His "Considerations Touching the Better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England" eventually, alas, were in vain.

XVI. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. M'Crie's Life of Melville. p. 153.
2. Documents illustrative of English Church History.
Gee and Hardy. p. 508.
3. Do. pp. 510 & 511.
4. Domestic State Papers. Vol. iii. No. 83. Sep. 1603.
5. p. 10 seq.
6. Cardwell's History of Conferences. pp. 201 & 202.
7. "The opinion of Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York,
touching certain matters, like to be brought in
question before the King's most excellent Majesty,
at the Conference at Court."
Cardwell's History of Conferences. pp. 154 & 155.
8. Cardwell's History of Conferences. p. 202. From The
Sum and Substance of the Conference at Hampton Court.
William Barlow, D.D., Dean of Chester.
The Account by Tobias Matthew, Bishop of Durham, is given
in Cardwell. p. 161 seq.
9. "What the King thought of Bacon's suggestions we are not
directly informed, but, judging from his subsequent
proceedings, I gather that he generally approved, and
was for his own part disposed to act in the spirit of
them."
"Francis Bacon and His Times." James Spedding.
Vol. I. p. 432.

XVII.

CHARLES I. THE FALKLAND and WILLIAMS SCHEMES.

The word accommodation did not occur again in James' reign. With the advent of his son, however, we come to a more copious age - the age of Charles I., an age which ushered in various schemes of comprehension, schemes which grew in intensity right down to the time of the Commonwealth, through the Restoration to the Revolution itself.

It does not, of course, fall within the scope of our subject to narrate the history of Charles nor describe, in detail, his absolutism in church and state. No doubt, politics and religion were inextricably intertwined. England, we can see, could have changed easily enough from the supremacy of the King to the supremacy of Parliament had not the Church party of the Long Parliament become the Royalist party of the civil war, had not, too, the mind of Pym been clouded by the suspicion that Charles and Laud were engaged in a conspiracy to restore England to the obedience of the Pope - indeed, the English people might have been won back to the loyal observance of the Prayer Book, without losing the earnestness of the Puritans - which was the accommodationists' hope - had not the Long Parliament abolished Episcopacy, and Puritanism become, it appeared, the associate of rebellion. For Puritanism's strong count was ever its appeal to conscience, its weak count that it had failed to establish under cover of the formularies of the church, an adequate ritual and discipline of its /

its own. We need not be surprised, accordingly, that the accommodations had both a political and a religious complexion.

Whether, however, this boded any good or was likely to lead to any measure of success we shall see as their genesis is unfolded.

The pamphlet war was an undoubted factor in raising interest in accommodation schemes. Anti-episcopal petitions were presented from old Puritan strongholds like Warwickshire, Bedfordshire and elsewhere. On December 11, 1640, for example, came the Root and Branch Petition - an expression of London's feeling.

"Whereas the government of Archbishops and Lord Bishops, etc., hath proved very prejudicial and dangerous both to the Church and Commonwealth We therefore most humbly pray and beseech this honourable Assembly, the premises considered, that the said Government, with all its dependencies, roots and branches, may be abolished."

The "Ministers' Petition", signed by seven hundred clergy of the Church of England, prayed that the Bishops might be removed from Parliament and that Presbyters should share in ordination and general ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

And, in this connection, it is well to note that three main parties existed - the High Church Party, with its belief in the divine right of Episcopacy, an intermediate party, not averse to limited Episcopacy on grounds of expediency and fitness and, finally, a root and branch party - Presbyterians, for the most part, of the school of Cartwright - who wished to assimilate the church polity of England to that of Scotland - a party with ramifications to Independency. All of these were represented in the Long Parliament, the third being returned very strongly and growing steadily /

steadily in power. Plainly, of course, the Long Parliament was determined to abolish Episcopacy. For all that, it is well to note that, between the extremes on either side, there was a mass of floating opinion which, if wisely handled, might have been won to moderate views. At the beginning of the Long Parliament, indeed, speaker after speaker arose in the House of Commons to denounce interference with individual liberty - speakers who were ready to sacrifice Episcopacy, if need be, who, nevertheless, had no grudge against Episcopacy in itself, provided it could be severed from despotic government. To many such a limited Episcopacy had a strong appeal - it being a method of preserving at once individual liberty and ecclesiastical tradition. So, too, it appeared from the pamphleteering which coincided with these debates, among the contributors being Bishop Hall, Archbishop Ussher, Lord Robert Brook, Salmasius of Leyden, John Milton, Edmund Calamy, Stephen Marshall, Dr. Thomas Young, William Prynne and the Scottish Commissioners, Henderson, Baillie, Gillespie, Blair and many others.² Bishop Hall issued in 1640 "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted by Jos. Hall, Bishop of Exon." This he followed (though anonymously) in January, 1641 with "Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, by a Dutiful Sonne of the Church." These gave the High Church party views. Alexander Henderson promptly produced "The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacy or Perpetual Presidency in the Church", followed by "The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland". Baillie, too, produced a new edition of his "Canterburian's Self-Conviction" and, thereafter, a tractate on /

on "The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Episcopacy", while Gillespie wrote on "The grounds of Presbyterial Government." The main answer, however, to Hall was a purely English Presbyterian production -

"An Answer to a Book entitled 'An Humble Remonstrance,' in which the Originall of Liturgy (and) Episcopacy, is discussed, and Quaeres propounded concerning both; the Parity of Bishops and Presbyters in Scripture demonstrated; the Occasion of their Unparity in Antiquity discovered; the Disparity of the ancient and our modern Bishops manifested; the Antiquity of Ruling Elders in the Church vindicated; the Prelaticall Church bounded.
Written by S.M.E.C.T.Y.M.N.U.U.S."

This cumbrous name consisted of the collected initials of the five authors - S.M., Stephen Marshall; E.C., Edmund Calamy; T.Y., Thomas Young; M.N., Matthew Newcomen; and U.U. (i.e., W), S., William Spurstow. Addressed to Parliament, as Hall's Remonstrance had been, it was destined to exert great influence. Hall replied to it in his "Defence", to which came the rejoinder "A Vindication". In turn, was published "A Short Answer by the Author of the Humble Remonstrance."

The debate was really one of great interest. The Smectymnuan divines contended that the primitive bishop was no more than a parochial pastor, while Hall argued that he was of an order distinct from presbyters, instituted by the apostles themselves and invested with the sole power of ordination and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.³ The Smectymnuan divines, on the other hand, argued that bishops and presbyters were originally the same, that ordination to the office of a bishop did not differ from the ordination of a presbyter and that there were no powers conveyed to a bishop from which presbyters were /

were secluded.⁴ They also hotly denied that presbyters could not ordain without a bishop.⁵

"Upon the whole, allowing that, in the third or fourth century, bishops were a distinct order from presbyters, yet, say these divines, our modern bishops of the church of England differ very widely from them; the primitive bishops were elected by a free suffrage of the presbyters, but ours by a conge d'elire from the king. They did not proceed against criminals but with the consent of their presbyters, and upon the testimony of several witnesses; whereas ours proceed by an oath ex officio, by which men are obliged to accuse themselves; the primitive bishops had no lordly titles and dignities, no lay-chancellors, commissaries, and other officials, nor did they engage in secular affairs, &c. After several comparisons of this kind, they recapitulate the late severities of the bishops in their ecclesiastical courts; and conclude with an humble petition to the high court of parliament, 'that if episcopacy be retained in the church it may be reduced to its primitive simplicity; and if they must have a liturgy, that there may be a consultation of divines to alter and reform the present; and that even then it may not be imposed upon the clergy, but left to the discretion of the minister, how much of it to read when there is a sermon.'" ⁶

Neal, it is interesting to note, was favourably impressed by Hall and thought there was a good chance of compromise.

"By this representation it appears, that the controversy between these divines might have been compromised, if the rest of the clergy had been of the same spirit and temper with bishop Hall; but the court-bishops would abate nothing as long as the crown could support them; and as the parliament increased in power, the Puritan divines stiffened in their demands, till methods of accommodation were impracticable." ⁷

Alas, the necessary conditions did not exist and so no accommodation followed. Two of the Smeectymnuans, Marshall and Calamy - be it noted - were invited to take part in the consultations promoted by the lords' committee for innovations in March 1641. Here they met Hall; and had the suggestions for accommodation agreed upon within the Jerusalem Chamber been accepted by parties outside, the approaching /

approaching overthrow of Episcopacy might have been averted. In his original views of church government, Calamy followed Ussher in taking a mean between extremes.

And now we come to Lord Falkland, whose name is an honoured one, a broad-minded man well fit to take his place in the list of the accommodationists. His mansion - we are told - was the rendezvous of not a few of the most learned men of the day - Sandys the poet, Hammond, Morley, Sheldon, Gataker, Chillingworth and other great scholars. Acting cordially with Hampden, Pym, Hyde and other leaders, he yet took no part in the impeachment of Laud, though he entertained an unfavourable opinion of him. His speech in the Long Parliament was a singularly powerful one.

"Mr. Speaker, I have represented no small quantity, and no mean degree, of guilt, but this charge does not lie against episcopacy, but against the persons who have abused that sacred function; for if we consider, that the first spreaders of Christianity, the first defenders of it, both with their ink and blood, as well as our late reformers, were all bishops; and even now, in this great defection of the order, there are some that have been neither proud nor ambitious; some that have been learned opposers of Popery, and zealous suppressors of Arminianism, between whom and their inferior clergy there has been no distinction in frequent preaching; whose lives are untouched, not only by guilt, but by malice; I say, if we consider this, we shall conclude, that bishops may be good men, and let us but give good men good rules, and we shall have good government and good times."⁸

He continued -

"I do not believe the order of bishops to be jure divino, nor do I think them unlawful; but since all great changes in government are dangerous, I am for trying if we cannot take away the inconveniences of bishops, and the inconveniences of no bishops. Let us therefore go upon the debate of grievances, and if the grievances may be taken away and the order stand, we shall not need to commit the London petition at all; but if it shall appear that the abolition of the one cannot be but by the destruction of the other, then let us now commit the London petition, but grant it."⁹

Lord Falkland found a strong supporter in the person of Lord George Digby.

"Mr. Speaker, we must divest ourselves of passion; we all agree a reformation of church-government is necessary; but before I can strike at the root, and agree to a total extirpation of episcopacy, it must be made manifest to me, (1.) That the mischiefs we have felt arise from the nature of episcopacy, and not from its abuse. (2.) Such a form of government must be set before us as is not liable to proportionable inconveniences. (3.) It must appear that the Utopia is practicable. Let us therefore lay aside the thoughts of extirpating bishops, and reduce them to their primitive standard; let us retrench their diocesses; let them govern by assemblies of their clergy let us exclude them from intermeddling in secular affairs, and appoint a standing committee to collect all the grievances of the church, and no man's votes shall be given with more zeal for redressing them than mine." 10

Others, such as Sir Benjamin Rudyard and Sir Harbottle Grimstone, spoke in the same strain - a mediating school. All, however, in vain - the bishops were finally ejected from the House of Peers and the general atmosphere was anything but favourable to accommodation.

Yet those of the *via media* did not despair - as witness the speech of Sir Edward Deering in committee, recommending a scheme of Ussher's type.

"That every shire should be a distinct diocess or church. Secondly, That in every shire or church twelve or more able divines should be appointed, in the nature of an old primitive constant presbytery. Thirdly, That over every presbytery there should be a president, let him be called bishop, or overseer, or moderator, or superintendent, or by what other name you please, provided there be one in every shire, for the government and direction of the presbytery, in the nature of the speaker of the house of commons, or chairman of a committee."

As Neal says, this scheme shows that the Puritans did not intend Presbyterian government, but only a reduction of Episcopacy to what they /

they considered to be a more primitive standard; and, if the bishops had but relinquished some part of their jurisdiction, subsequent events might have been different.

Next in order came Bishop Williams' scheme - a scheme which was presented to the House of Lords but which was dropped after a first reading. Williams, called by Blaxland 'astute but not very scrupulous', was one of the most celebrated bishops of the seventeenth century, whose career, however, was a chequered one of brilliant achievement and failure. His learning, caution and ability to see both sides of a question undoubtedly made him a fit mediator - as witness his mediatory tone in the dispute which ensued over the "Petition of Right". Something of his influence and power he recovered for a short period after his release from prison at the beginning of the Long Parliament and so was ready to use his gifts once more. He was appointed chairman of the committee to enquire into innovations and the reformation of the church. In the debates upon Episcopacy, too, he tried to play the part of moderator, proposing that assistants should be appointed to help the bishop in exercise of jurisdiction and ordination. "Even among the bishops themselves", says J.R. Green, "the more prominent saw the need for consenting to the abolition of Chapters and Bishops' Courts, as well as to the creation of a council of ministers in each diocese, which had been suggested by Archbishop Ussher as a check on episcopal autocracy. A scheme to this effect was drawn up by Bishop Williams of Lincoln; but was far from meeting the wishes of the general body of the Commons."¹²

The particulars were these -

1. That every bishop, being within his diocess, and not disabled by ill health, shall preach once every Lord's day, or pay 5 l. to the poor, to be levied by the next justice of peace.
2. That no bishop shall be a justice of peace, except the dean of Westminster in Westminster and St. Martin's. (This seems to be a proviso for himself.)
3. That every bishop shall have twelve assistants besides the dean and chapter; four to be chosen by the king, four by the lords, and four by the commons, for jurisdiction and ordination.
4. That in all vacancies, these assistants, with the dean and chapter, shall present to the king, three of the ablest divines in the diocess, who shall choose one to be bishop.
5. That deans and prebendaries shall not be nonresidents at their cathedrals above sixty days.
6. That sermons shall be preached in the cathedrals twice every Lord's day, once every holiday, and a lecture on Wednesdays, with a salary of one hundred marks per annum.
7. That all archbishops, bishops, and collegiate churches, &c. shall be obliged to give a fourth part of their fines, and improved rents, to buy in impropriations.
8. That all double-beneficed men shall pay the value of half their living to the curate.
9. No appeal shall be made to the court of arches, or court of audience.
10. It is proposed, that canons and ecclesiastical constitutions shall be drawn up, and suited to the laws of the realm, by sixteen learned persons, six to be denominated by the king, five by the lords, and five by the commons."

(See Neal's History of the Puritans. Vol. II. p. 400.

Also Scrinia Reserata. Hacket's Life of Williams.

Part II. p. 146.)

But nothing came of these proposals either. As Canon Perry says -

"This /

"This attempt, like most compromises, did not please any one, and fell to the ground." (History of the English Church. Vol. II. p. 446.)

The name of Archbishop Ussher now arises at this juncture, although we shall reserve our closer study of him to the portion of the thesis dealing with Ireland. His scheme was for the reduction of Episcopacy into the form of synodical government received in the ancient church - which, however, was not published in an authentic form till 1658.

"His Grace supposes, that of the many elders that ruled the church of Ephesus, there was one stated president whom our Saviour calls the angel: and whom Ignatius, in one of his epistles, calls the bishop, to whom, in conjunction with the elders or presbyters, the whole government of the church, both as to doctrine and discipline, was committed. He therefore proposes, that these be continued; and for a regulation of their jurisdiction, that suffragans should be appointed to hold monthly synods of presbyters, from whom there should be an appeal to diocesan, provincial and national ones; and more particularly,

1. That the rector of every parish, with the churchwardens, should admonish and reprove such as live scandalously, according to the quality of their offence; and if by this means they are not reclaimed, to present them to the next monthly synod, and in the meantime debar them the Lord's table.

2. Whereas by a statute of 26 Henry VIII. suffragans are appointed to be erected in twenty-six several places of this kingdom, the number of them may be conformed to the number of the several rural deaneries, into which every diocess is subdivided; which being done, the suffragan may every month assemble a synod of the several rectors or incumbent pastors within the precinct, and according to the major part of their votes conclude all matters that should be brought into debate before them.

3. A diocesan synod might be held once or twice a year, wherein all the suffragans, and the rest of the rectors and incumbent pastors, or a certain select number out of every deanery, within that diocess, might meet, with whose consent all /

all things might be concluded by the bishop or superintendent; or in his absence by one of his suffragans, whom he should appoint as moderator in his room; and here the transactions of the monthly synods may be revised and reformed.

4. The provincial synod may consist of all the bishops and suffragans, and such of the clergy as should be elected out of every diocese within the province: the primate of either province might be moderator, or in his room, one of the bishops appointed by him. This synod might be held every third year, and if the parliament be sitting, both the primates and provincial synods might join together, and make up one national synod, wherein all appeals from inferior synods might be received, all their acts examined, and all ecclesiastical affairs relating to the state of the church in general established." ¹³

Yet the scheme came to nought, too - chiefly because of "the stiffness of the bishops", Fuller observing that moderation might have saved Episcopacy and prevented the civil war. ¹⁴ It has frequently been commented upon - irony of history - that Ussher's scheme, which would have satisfied the Puritans but could not be obtained from the King, was afterwards, at the time of the Isle of Wight treaty, favourable to the King but could not be obtained from the Puritans - a curious change of outlook. Was it one of providence's punishments?

Ussher, it is interesting to note, at the request of Bishop Hall entered the lists against "root - and - branch" reform with his "The Judgment of Doctor Rainoldes touching the Originall of Episcopacy, more largely confirmed out of Antiquity by James, Archbishop of Armagh." (John Reynolds, whom we have already studied.)

Against all Episcopal government, however, no less an antagonist than Milton thundered, his mighty name being a sore deterrent not only to the school of Hall but the school of Ussher, too.

His /

His first pamphlet "Of Reformation touching Church Discipline in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it: Two Books written by a Friend" was a vehement denunciation of the bishops. His second "Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and whether it may be deduced from Apostolic Times, by virtue of those Testimonies which are alleged to that purpose in some late Treatises - one whereof goes under the name of James, Archbishop of Armagh" displayed a strong critique of Ussher. His third was a savage assault on Hall - "Animadversions on the Remonstrant's Defence against Smectymnuus." Hall replied with "A Modest Confutation" to which Milton answered in an "Apology", his fifth pamphlet, his fourth and greatest pamphlet having been issued previously - "The Reason of Church Government urg'd against Prelaty, by Mr. John Milton, in Two Books." This gave Milton's own ideal of a non-coercive Presbyterianism, based on popular suffrage, free from state patronage and control, depending on moral and religious motives and not on political sanctions for its driving force.

Alas, if Hall's scheme was impossible and Ussher's impracticable, Milton's was both, leaving him a snarling critic of all around him.

XVII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Documents illustrative of English Church History.
Gee and Hardy. pp. 537 & 538.
Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. II. p. 356.
The counterblast is given in Neal. Vol. II.
p. 358 seq.
2. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. II. p. 344 seq.
3. Do. p. 349 seq.
4. Do. p. 351 for further details.
5. Do. p. 352.
6. Do. pp. 353 and 354.
7. Do. p. 354.
8. Do. pp. 366 and 367.
W.H. Hutton calls him "fascinating Lucius Carey, Viscount Falkland", who "remained, with every wide literary interest and with considerable freedom of speculation, a sincere Christian of the English Church."
History of English Church. Charles I. to Death of Anne. p. 47.
9. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. II. p. 367.
10. Do. pp. 368 and 369.
For Falkland's broad sympathies see Hutton. p. 119.
cf. B. Blaxland. The Struggle with Puritanism.
pp. 76 and 77.
"A conspicuous example of this type of Churchman was Sir Edward Dering, who at first posed as a moderate Churchman and reformer with a desire to restore Primitive Episcopacy. A few months afterwards he introduced the 'Root and Branch Bill', which was to destroy the office of bishop altogether. Such was the fate of the 'moderate' Churchmen. They were obliged in the end to defend the Church and take their stand upon the principles which Laud had laid down; or they were helplessly swept into the ranks of those who were determined to destroy, 'root and branch', the ancient Church of the country."
11. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. II. p. 390.
12. Short History. Everyman Ed. pp. 507 and 508.
13. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. II. pp. 400 and 401.
14. Do. p. 402.

XVIII.

THE UXBRIDGE and ISLE of WIGHT ACCOMMODATIONS.

We continue our narrative, unfolding the story, however, only in so far as it pertains to our subject of accommodations. The period we have now reached is one of Puritan triumph and Presbyterian ascendancy, viz. from 1643 to 1649.

Parliament, in reassembling on October 1641, had addressed itself to the Grand Remonstrance - whose severities were yet tempered by hopeful passages -

"We confess our intention is, and our endeavours have been, - to reduce within bounds that exorbitant power which the prelates have assumed unto themselves, so contrary both to the word of God and to the laws of the land, to which end we passed the bill for the removing them from their temporal power and employments, that so the better they might with meekness apply themselves to the discharge of their functions, which bill themselves opposed, and were the principal instruments of crossing it."

The King, however, only answered by speaking disdainfully of their proposed ecclesiastical reforms.² This he followed by the attempted arrest of the Five Members who had taken a leading part in formulating the Remonstrance. Though baffled in this, it practically brought about a crisis, culminating in an appeal to arms. Indeed, on August 22 Charles set up his royal standard on Nottingham Hill and the struggle began. Assuredly, it was not Presbyterianism that brought on the war, but the war that brought in Presbyterianism. By military necessity the system became organized in England, the fact being that by the end of 1643 the outlook for the parliamentary party was sufficiently depressing. The west, in the main, had /

had declared for the King, so had the north, with the exception of Hull and Lancashire. While, too, Parliament had gained strength in the eastern counties, it held the midlands only with difficulty. In their anxiety the Puritans turned to Scotland with the result that in November 1643, the Scottish Parliament agreed to send 21,000 men to their assistance, only, however, on the understanding that the Solemn League and Covenant should be accepted in England, and so pledge the two nations to unite for the reformation of religion, according to the Word of God and the example of the best Reformed Churches. As we know, there were many who were willing to modify or even set aside Episcopacy but there were also many Independents who would be as rigorously repressed by the Scottish system as they had been under the bishops. Necessity, however, knowing no law, terms, perforce, had to be accepted. When, accordingly, it had passed both Houses, the Commons and the Assembly of Divines swore to the Solemn League and Covenant on September 25; and somewhat later the few Peers who still lingered at Westminster swore to it also. The following February it was universally imposed on Englishmen over eighteen years of age, the names of those refusing to be formally certified. In Edinburgh the General Assembly laid it down that there was no hope of unity in religion till there was one form of ecclesiastical government. A parliamentary ordinance, accordingly, was passed on August 19, 1645 for the setting up of Presbyterian government as the national form of religion - a triumph more apparent than real, however. The parish churches of London, one hundred and thirty-seven /

thirty-seven in number, were to be arranged in twelve classes, the Chapel of the Rolls, the two Serjeants' Inns, and the four Inns of Court together making up the thirteenth. For the country at large county committees were to map out classical districts, the several classes as approved by Parliament to have power to constitute congregational elderships. These elderships corresponding to the Kirk session of the Scottish Church were to meet once a week, the classes corresponding to the presbytery once a month, the provincial synod twice a year, and the National Assembly to meet in session as summoned by Parliament and not otherwise. By a second parliamentary ordinance dated March 14, 1646, it was commanded that a choice of elders be made forthwith throughout the kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, in their respective churches and chapels.³

And so says Neal -

"The Presbyterian form of church-government became the national establishment, by way of probation, as far as an ordinance of parliament could make it; for the preamble sets forth, 'that if upon trial it was not found acceptable, it should be reversed or amended. It declares further that the two houses found it very difficult to make their new settlement agree with the laws and government of the kingdom; that therefore it could not be expected, that a present rule in every particular should be settled at once, but that there will be need of supplements and additions, and perhaps alterations, as experience shall bring to light the necessity thereof.' The parliament apprehended they had now established the plan of the Presbyterian discipline, though it proved not to the satisfaction of any one party of Christians; so hard is it to make a good settlement when men dig up all at once old foundations."⁴

Certainly, the system was sufficiently rigid. The basis was parochial. Every parishioner living within a given area was required /

required to take his place in the parochial organisation and submit to the parochial authorities. Every parish congregation was to choose its representative to sit in the Provincial or National Assembly, and no ecclesiastical community except that of the parish was to be allowed to exist.

Cromwell's proposal to consider 'tender consciences' was negatived without division - this was on the 6th of January, 1645 and on the 13th the House gave its assent to the ordinary Presbyterian system by a resolution that parochial congregations should be combined in groups under presbyteries. Such was the Presbyterian system in the heart of English Episcopacy.

The date just mentioned now brings us to the consideration of the Uxbridge Accommodation. In this small Middlesex town it was agreed to hold a treaty of peace, commencing on January 30, 1645 and continuing for twenty days. There were sixteen commissioners for the King, viz. nine lords, six commoners, and one divine; twelve for the parliament, and ten for the Scots, and one divine, viz. Mr. Henderson; the King's divine was Dr. Steward, who was assisted by Dr. Sheldon, Laney, Fern, Potter, and Hammond. Assistant divines for the parliament were, Mr. Vines, Marshall, Cheynel, and Chiesly. These with their retinue, to the number of one hundred and eight persons, were included in the safe conduct. The subjects to be dealt with were religion, the militia and Ireland - of these only the first concerning us. The treaty was preceded on both sides by a day of fasting and prayer, also by a sermon - a sermon, however, little likely to promote a spirit of /

of conciliation.⁵ Neither can it be denied that King's commissioners and parliament commissioners alike came with the intention of surrendering little if anything. Charles' instructions to his commissioners were these -

"Here the government of the church will be the chief question, wherein two things are to be considered, conscience and policy; for the first, I must declare, that I cannot yield to the change of the government by bishops, not only because I fully concur with the most general opinion of Christians in all ages, in episcopacy's being the best government, but likewise I hold myself particularly bound by the oath I took at my coronation, not to alter the government of this church from what I found it; and as for the church-patrimony I cannot suffer any diminution or alienation of it, it being, without peradventure, sacrilege, and likewise contrary to my coronation-oath; but whatsoever shall be offered for rectifying abuses, if any have crept in, or for the ease of tender consciences (provided the foundation be not damaged), I am content to hear, and willing to return a gracious answer. Touching the second, that is the point of policy, as it is the King's duty to protect the church, so the church is reciprocally bound to assist the King in the maintenance of his just authority. Upon these views my predecessors have been always careful (especially since the Reformation) to keep the dependance of the clergy entirely upon the crown, without which it will scarce set fast on the King's head; therefore you must do nothing to change or lessen this natural dependance."
(Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. pp. 214 and 215, quoting Rushworth.)

The parliament commissioners, on the other hand, were ordered to demand the passing of a bill for abolishing and taking away Episcopal government; for confirming the ordinance for the calling and sitting of the Assembly of divines; that the Directory for public worship, and the propositions concerning church government, hereunto annexed, be confirmed as a part of reformation of religion and uniformity; that his Majesty take the Solemn League and Covenant and that an act of parliament be passed, enjoining the taking /

taking it by all the subjects of the three kingdoms. The propositions annexed to these demands were these viz:-

That the ordinary way of dividing Christians into distinct congregations, as most expedient for edification, be by the respective bounds of their dwellings.

That the ministers, and other church-officers in each particular congregation, shall join in the government of the church in such manner as shall be established by parliament.

That many congregations shall be under one presbyterial government.

That the church be governed by congregational, classical and synodical assemblies, in such manner as shall be established by parliament.

That synodical assemblies shall consist both of provincial and national assemblies.

It has to be admitted that instructions so opposed boded little good for accommodation prospects. Neither, may it be added, did the debate of the divines. The synopsis of Henderson's speech is certainly interesting as giving the type of argument used -

"That now the question was not, whether the government of the church by bishops was lawful, but whether it was so necessary that Christianity could not subsist without it. - That this latter position could not be maintained in the affirmative, without condemning all other reformed churches in Europe. - That the parliament of England had found Episcopacy a very inconvenient and corrupt government - that the hierarchy had been a public grievance from the Reformation downwards - that the bishops had always abetted Popery, had retained many superstitious rites and customs in their worship and government: and over and above had lately brought in a great many novelties into the church and made a nearer approach to the Roman communion, to the great scandal of the Protestant churches as Germany, France, Scotland, and Holland. - That the prelates had embroiled the British island, and made the two nations of England and Scotland fall foul upon each other. - That the rebellion in Ireland, and the civil war /

war in England, may be charged upon them - that for these reasons the parliament had resolved to change this inconvenient mischievous government, and set up another in the room of it, more naturally formed for the advancement of piety - that this alteration was the best expedient to unite all Protestant churches, and extinguish the remains of Popery - he hoped therefore the king would concur in so commendable and godly an undertaking; and conceived his majesty's conscience could not be urged against such a compliance, because he had already done it in Scotland; nor could he believe that episcopacy was absolutely necessary to the support of the Christian religion." 6

Dr. Steward replied -

"he knew their lordships were too well acquainted with the constitution of the church of England, and the basis upon which it stood, to imagine it could be taken by the force of Mr. Henderson's rhetoric - that he was firmly of opinion, that a government, which from the planting of Christianity in England had continued without interruption; that a government under which Christianity had spread and flourished to a remarkable degree, could have nothing vicious or antichristian in its frame; that he expected that those who had sworn themselves to an abolition of this primitive constitution, and came hither to persuade their lordships and his majesty to a concurrence, would have endeavoured to prove the unlawfulness of that government they pressed so strongly to remove; - but though in their sermons and prints they gave episcopacy an antichristian addition, Mr. Henderson had prudently declined charging so deep, and only argued from the inconveniences of that government, and the advantages which would be consequent on an alteration. Forasmuch as a union with the Protestant churches abroad was the chief reason for this change, the doctor desired to know what foreign church they designed for a pattern - that he was sure the model in the Directory had no great resemblance to any foreign reformed church - and though he would not enter upon a censure of those communions, yet it was well known that the most learned men of those churches had lamented a defect in their reformation; and that the want of episcopacy was an unhappy circumstance - that they had always paid a particular reverence to the church of England, and looked on it as the most perfect constitution, upon the score of its having retained all that was venerable in antiquity - from hence he proceeded to enlarge upon the apostolical institution of episcopacy, and endeavoured to prove, that without bishops the sacerdotal character could not be conveyed, nor the sacraments administered to any significance. As to his majesty's consenting to put down episcopacy in Scotland, he would say nothing, /

nothing, though he knew his majesty's present thoughts upon that subject. But he observed that the king was farther obliged in this kingdom than in the other; that in England he was tied by his coronation-oath to maintain the rights of the church, and that this single engagement was a restraint upon his majesty's conscience, not to consent to the abolition of episcopacy, or the alienation of church-lands."

The Marquis of Hertford, somewhat tired by claims of divine right, said -

"The reverend doctors on the king's part affirm, that episcopacy is jure divino; the reverend ministers on the other part affirm, that presbytery is jure divino; for my part, I think neither the one nor the other, nor any government whatsoever, to be jure divino; and I desire we may leave this argument, and proceed to debate on the particular proposals."

This, accordingly, was done. The king's commissioners delivered in their answer to the parliament's demands in writing, with their reasons for not consenting to the bill for abolishing Episcopacy or establishing the Directory in place of the Common Prayer, also for not advising the king to take the Covenant. These they absolutely refused to entertain. However, for the purpose of reconciling differences in religion they offered the following propositions -

"1. That freedom be left to all persons, of what opinion soever, in matters of ceremony; and that all the penalties of the laws and customs which enjoin those ceremonies be suspended.

2. That the bishop shall exercise no act of jurisdiction or ordination, without the consent of the presbyters, who shall be chosen by the clergy of each diocess, out of the most learned and grave ministers of the diocess.

3. That the bishop keep his constant residence in his diocess, except when he shall be required by his majesty to attend him on any occasion, and that (if he be not hindered by the infirmities of old age or sickness) he preach every Sunday in some church within his diocess.

4. That the ordination of ministers shall be always in a public and solemn manner, and very strict rules observed concerning the sufficiency and other qualifications of those men who shall be received into holy orders, and the bishops shall not receive any into holy orders without the approbation and consent of the presbyters, or the major part of them.

5. That a competent maintenance and provision be established by act of parliament, to such vicarages as belong to bishops, deans, and chapters, out of the impropriations, and according to the value of those impropriations of the several parishes.

6. That for time to come no man shall be capable of two parsonages or vicarages, with cure of souls.

7. That towards settling the public peace, 100,000 l. shall be raised by act of parliament out of the estates of bishops, deans, and chapters, in such manner as shall be thought fit by the king and two houses of parliament, without the alienation of any of the said lands.

8. That the jurisdiction in causes testamentary, decimal, matrimonial, be settled in such manner as shall seem most convenient by the king and two houses of parliament.

9. That one or more acts of parliament be passed for regulating of visitations, and against immoderate fees in ecclesiastical courts, and abuses by frivolous excommunication, and all other abuses in the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in such manner as shall be agreed upon by the king and both houses of parliament."

These propositions were certainly helpful as far as they went, particularly numbers 2. and 4. which commended themselves to the accommodationists. Taken as a whole, however, they were not sufficiently radical for the parliament commissioners. There is some justification for Neal's opinion - that the proposals had come too late - that had they been offered twelve months sooner, before the Scots were called in with their Solemn League and Covenant, they would have been a foundation of peace.⁹ Both sets of commissioners had their hands tied and were not really free to negotiate. /

negotiate. So the break-down is not to be wondered at. The last day of the treaty the parliament continued sitting till 9 p.m., hoping to receive welcome news from their commissioners. When, however, the express came it was but to report complete failure, the king's stiffness apparently being intensified by news of Montrose's successes and the high hopes he entertained therefrom. Undoubtedly, there was, as a result, no small disappointment in the school of the *via media*, witness the vain last minute attempt of the Earl of Southampton (who, at one time, had supported the resolution of the House of Commons that redress of grievances should precede supply but had become one of Charles' closest advisers) to save the situation.¹⁰ Alas, the king's plottings with the Irish Roman Catholics were unlikely to confirm moderate men's opinions of him in any projected treaty. "Let the reader now judge", says Neal, "what prospect there could be of a well-grounded peace by the treaty of Uxbridge! What security there was for the Protestant religion! How little ground of reliance on the king's promises! and consequently, to whose account the calamities of the war, and the misery and confusions which followed after this period, ought to be placed."

So Uxbridge is added to the list of failures.

It is well to note, however, that some of the King's own concessions, for which he was indebted to the Oxford clergy, were constructive and suggestive.

Says S.R. Gardiner -

"At least it compared favourably with anything produced on the other side. Episcopacy was to be maintained, but the bishops /

bishops were not to exercise coercive jurisdiction without the consent of presbyters chosen by the clergy of the diocese. Abuses were to be remedied by Act of Parliament. The Book of Common Prayer was to be retained subject to such alterations as might be agreed on, and - far more important than all this - freedom was to be 'left to all persons of what opinions soever in matters of ceremony, and in all the penalties of the laws and customs which enjoin these ceremonies' to 'be suspended.'

"We think it lawful", they (the Oxford clergy) had declared, "that a toleration be given - by suspending the penalties of all laws - both to the Presbyterians and Independents. There is evidently here the germ, or more than the germ of the great policy of 1689."

(History of the Great Civil War, 1642-1649. Vol. II. p. 71.)

Apparently there was, at least, a gleam of hope for the future.

And now the accommodation movement is transferred to the Isle of Wight. The decisive battle of the Civil War having been fought at Naseby on June 14, 1645 to Charles' discomfiture, he continued the losing struggle and finally surrendered himself to the Scots at Newark in May 1646. On January 30, 1647 the Scots gave up the King to the Commissioners of the New Parliament, he being moved to various places of detention but eventually to Hampton Court, whence, however, he escaped to the Isle of Wight. There, in Carisbrooke Castle, near Newport, he was as much a prisoner as before.

At Newport, accordingly, by arrangement of King and Parliament, the next attempted accommodation had its venue. Several noblemen, gentlemen, divines, and lawyers were appointed to assist the King in the treaty, who were to stand behind his Majesty's chair and hear the debates, but not to speak, except when the King withdrew into another room for their advice. The names of his divines were - Dr. Juxon, Bishop of London, Dr. Duppa, Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Sheldon, Dr. Hammond, Dr. Oldisworth, Dr. Sanderson, Dr. Turner, Dr. /

Dr. Haywood - and towards the end of the treaty, Dr. Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh - Dr. Bramhall, Dr. Prideaux, Dr. Warner, Dr. Ferne and Dr. Morley. Dr. Brownrig, Bishop of Exeter, was also sent for, but he was under restraint. Dr. Sheldon, Dr. Hammond and Dr. Oldisworth, being in like situation, were not permitted to stand. The Parliament appointed five noblemen, and ten commoners, with four divines, to assist them in their debates touching religion, viz:- Mr. Vines, Mr. Caryl, Dr. Seaman and Mr. Marshall. The treaty was to continue forty days. On September 12, the Parliament observed a day of public fasting and prayer, for a blessing; and some days after, the King and his household did the same.

The conferences, after preliminary religious exercises, opened on Monday, September 18, at the house of Sir William Hodges. (See Rushworth. Historical Collections. Part IV. Vol. II. p. 1266).

On October 2, Charles agreed that -

"the assembly of divines at Westminster be confirmed for three years; that the Directory and Presbyterian government be confirmed for the same time, provided that neither himself nor those of his judgment be obliged to comply with it; that a consultation in the mean time be had with the assembly, and twenty divines of his majesty's nomination, what form of church-government shall be established afterward, with a clause for the ease of tender consciences. His majesty consented farther, that legal estates for lives, or for a term of years not exceeding ninety-nine, should be made out of the bishops' lands and revenues, for the satisfaction of them that have purchased them, provided that the inheritance may still remain to the church, and the rest be preserved for their maintenance." "

These concessions, however, were not considered satisfactory.

the King, accordingly, desired to confer with the parliament divines - the subsequent discussion, may we say, being highly reminiscent of the Smectymnuan discussion already described. Papers were interchanged by the respective parties, papers which hammered out the learned arguments for and against Episcopacy with a heavy hand - into the details of which, however, we need not enter.¹² Eventually Charles was forced - the victorious army approaching London - to come to terms. He informed the commissioners -

"that though he could not with a good conscience consent to the abolishing of episcopacy, because he believed the substance of it to be of apostolical institution, he was willing to reduce it to the primitive usage; and if his two houses should so advise, he would be content to lessen the extent and multiply the number of diocesses. He still apprehended the entire alienation of the bishops' lands by sale to be sacrilege. - He was willing to assent to the calling and sitting of the assembly of divines as desired. - He would also confirm the public use of the Directory in all churches and chapels, and would repeal so much of all statutes as concerned the Book of Common Prayer only; provided the use thereof might be continued in his majesty's chapel for himself and his household; and that the same (i.e. the Directory) should be confirmed by act of parliament for three years, provided a consultation be had in the mean time with the assembly of divines as before mentioned. - Touching the articles of religion (the assembly's confession), his majesty desired farther time to examine them before he bound up himself and his subjects in matters of faith and doctrine. - His majesty will consent to an act for better observation of the Lord's day, and to prevent saying of mass. - But as to the covenant, his majesty was not satisfied to take it, nor to impose it upon others."¹³

These concessions, however, were voted unsatisfactory by the two houses at Westminster.¹⁴ Accordingly, his Majesty consented further on October 21 -

1. That archbishops, chancellors, deans, and the whole hierarchy, be abolished except bishops.

2. /

2. That none but the Presbyterian government be exercised for three years.

3. That in case no settlement should be agreed upon within that time, that then for the future the power of ordination should not be exercised by bishops without the counsel and assistance of presbyters; that no other episcopal jurisdiction should be exercised but such as should be agreed upon in parliament; and if within that time his majesty should be convinced that episcopacy is not agreeable to the word of God, or that Christ commanded any other government, he will embrace it, and take episcopacy quite away. The houses being still dissatisfied with these concessions, his majesty added, November 4, that he would make no new bishops for three years; and for the farther satisfaction of the parliament, he would not insist upon the use of the Common Prayer in his own chapel for that time, but would make use of some other form of divine service for himself, and forbid mass to be said in the queen's chapel. This was his majesty's final answer, which the commons voted unsatisfactory, and ordered the commissioners to acquaint him with their votes. ¹⁵

The treaty was prolonged three weeks after this, the commissioners doing their best to bring about an understanding, and especially stressing the point - which reminds us of the Leighton type of argument - that it was not the apostolical bishop that was destined for abolition but the prelatical. (Rushworth. Part IV. Vol. II. pp. 1334, 1335 and 1336.). All, however, in vain. Certainly the King had given up the pillars of the hierarchy, by consenting to abolish archbishops, deans and chapters and granting that a bishop should not act without his presbyters - all tantamount to Ussher's scheme. There was, all the same, no common basis of understanding - only mutual suspicion. To the King the English and Scottish Presbyterians seemed overweening in ambition, while, in turn, to the Presbyterians the King was dilatory, resolute in disputing every inch of ground, untrustworthy, an adept at interpreting away his concessions. Even the presence of Archbishop /

Archbishop Ussher was ineffectual to save the situation, though he offered his own scheme for the reduction of Episcopacy which, though previously rejected by the King, was now acceptable - as, indeed, before it had been acceptable to the Presbyterians but was now unacceptable. Various extensions of the treaty were made and last moment appeals voiced but fruitlessly - the commissioners took their leave and the Newport Accommodation, like the Uxbridge, was unaccomplished. Says Marsden, of the Newport concessions, they "ought to have been cheerfully embraced. They satisfied the commissioners who waited on the King from parliament; and, in the judgment of Baxter and the wisest of the puritans, they ought to have satisfied their party." ^{16.}

Alas, jealousies again had wrecked all hopes.

XVIII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Documents illustrative of English Church History.
Gee and Hardy. p. 561.
2. Do. p. 562 for the King's Proclamation.
3. The details are carefully given in W.A. Shaw. A History
of the English Church during the civil wars and under
the Commonwealth. 1640-1660. Vol. II. pp. 1 to 174.
See also Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III.
pp. 280, 281 & 282.
4. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. pp. 249 & 250.
5. Do. p. 212.
See also J.B. Marsden. The History of the Later Puritans.
1642-1662. p. 141.
6. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. pp. 216 & 217.
7. Do. pp. 216-218, quoting Clarendon.
8. Do. pp. 219 & 220.
9. Do. p. 221.
cf. W.H. Hutton. History of the English Church.
Charles I. to Death of Anne. pp. 133 & 134.
cf. Mackinnon. A History of Modern Liberty.
Vol. III. p. 427.
"Their concessions would have been eminently
reasonable and satisfactory five years before.
They had come too late to be acceptable now,
even if Charles could be relied on to enforce
them. They were far from satisfying the
religious convictions, whether Presbyterian
or Independent, of a large section of the
Commons, and their acceptance would, moreover,
involve a breach of faith on the part of
Parliament towards its Scottish allies."
10. D.N.B. Vol. LXIII. p. 154. Article "Wriothesley,
Thomas, fourth Earl of Southampton, 1607-1667."
(Sidney Lee.).
11. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. p. 425.
12. Do. p. 426 seq.
cf. J.B. Marsden. The History of the Later Puritans.
1642-1662. pp. 281 & 282.
"The king's acquaintance with the subject, though
it was no doubt the great religious controversy
of his age, is surprising. At their own weapons
he proved himself no unequal match for the four
champions of the Puritan cause."
See Rushworth. Part IV. Vol. II. pp. 1286 & 1287.
Baxter says the Parliament Divines came out of the debate
with great honour.
He has, however, two criticisms.
"1. /

"1. They seem not to me to have answered satisfactorily to the main Argument fetcht from the Apostles own Government, with which Saravia had inclined me to some Episcopacy before; though Miracles and Infallibility were Apostolical temporary Priviledges; yet Church Government is an ordinary thing to be continued; and therefore as the Apostles had Successors as they were Preachers, I see not but that they must have Successors as Church Governours: And it seemeth unlikely to me, that Christ should settle a Form of Government in his Church, which was to continue but for one Age, and then to be transformed into another Species. Could I be sure what was the Government in the Days of the Apostles themselves, I should be satisfied what should be the Government now.

2. They seem not to me to have taken the Course which should have settled these distracted Churches: Instead of disputing against all Episcopacy, they should have changed Diocesan Prelacy into such an Episcopacy as the Conscience of the King might have admitted, and as was agreeable to that which the Church had in the two or three first Ages. I confess, Mr. Vines wrote to me as their excuse in this and other Matters of the Assembly, that the Parliament tied them up from treating or disputing of any thing at all, but what they appointed or proposed to them: But I think plain dealing with such Leaders had been best, and to have told them this is our Judgment, and in the matters of God and his Church we will serve you according to our Judgment, or not at all. (But indeed if they were not of one Mind among themselves, this could not be expected.)

Archbishop Usher there took the rightest course, who offered the King his Reduction of Episcopacy to the form of Presbytery: And he told me himself, that before the King had refused it, but at the Isle of Wight he accepted it, and as he would not when others would, so others would not when he would."

Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part I. p. 62.

13. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. pp. 433 & 434.
 See Rushworth. Part IV. Vol. II. pp. 1301, 1302 & 1303.
 S.R. Gardiner. History of the Great Civil War. 1642-1649.
 Vol. II. p. 474.

"He was ready to give way in some degree. The Episcopacy, he explained, on the maintenance of which he insisted after the three years of Presbyterianism came to an end, was the primitive Episcopacy of which so much had been heard in 1641. Bishops were 'to have counsel and assistance of Presbyters in ordination and jurisdiction, /

jurisdiction, and in the last were and are limitable by the civil power.'"

14. Rushworth. Part IV. Vol. II. pp. 1308, 1312 & 1323.
 15. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. pp. 434 & 435.
 16. Rushworth. Part IV. Vol. II. pp. 1321 & 1322.
 Marsden. The History of the Later Puritans. 1642-1662.

p. 282.

And yet, says Baxter -

"I know that if the Divines and Parliament had agreed for a moderate Episcopacy with the King, some Presbyterians of Scotland would have been against it, and many Independents of England, and the Army would have made it the matter of odious Accusations and Glanours."
 Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part I. p. 62.

XIX.

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY and ACCOMMODATION.

It is hardly possible to narrate the story of the accommodation movement without some mention of the Westminster Assembly - which, while it may have been disparaged by Clarendon, Milton and Walker, and but faintly praised by Neal, yet occupied the first place of all synods held in the Reformed Churches, not even excepting that of Dort. It has to be admitted, of course, that it accomplished but little in the way of comprehension of Presbytery and Episcopacy, nevertheless accommodation was a word very frequently employed in its deliberations, the specific accommodation being between Presbytery and Independency. As we shall see, there are many "might have beens" had only the Assembly been carried through as originally intended.

It is, of course, no business of ours to give the story of that famous gathering nor detail its actions, its classic doctrinal and disciplinary standards, and debates - rather do we dwell on what is relative to our subject. Admittedly, this council was a creation of state authority but the same could be said of the ancient oecumenical councils, as well as of the Synod of Dort, Parliament nominating the members, with the exception of the Scottish commissioners who were appointed by the General Assembly and admitted by Parliament. On June 12, 1643, it was that the ordinance was issued commanding that the assembly of divines should be convened at Westminster on the first day of July following, to effect /

effect a more perfect reformation of the Church of England in its liturgy, discipline and government on the basis of the Word of God, and thus to bring it into nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland and the Reformed Churches on the Continent.¹ The Assembly was to consist of 121 members in all, viz., 30 lay assessors (10 Lords and 20 Commoners), 121 divines who were selected from the different counties, chiefly from among the Presbyterians, with a few of the most influential Episcopalians and Independents. Parliament's broad intention must be noted - to comprehend within the Assembly representatives of all the leading parties of the English Church with the exception of that of Archbishop Laud which could hardly expect to be included. Says Stoughton - "These appointments would fall in with the views of such Members of Parliament as still wished for a modified Episcopacy".² The selection, assuredly, was judicious and wise - though there were remarkable omissions which, for our present study, must be deeply regretted - men like Richard Baxter, John Owen, William Chillingworth, Ralph Cudworth and Bryan Walton.³ It is to be regretted, too, that the invitations to the Colonial Churches of New England were not accepted - on the other hand, the fraternal letters to the Belgic, French, Helvetic and other Reformed Churches were warmly welcomed. In doctrine the members were at one - Calvinists. As regards church government and discipline, however, it was different. The accommodationists, nevertheless, having in mind the personnel, entertained the highest hopes. Except, indeed, the Scottish commissioners, the members were /

were in Episcopal orders, educated in the universities and mostly graduates - practically all of them, conformists. Of the Episcopalians there were four prelates, Ussher, Brownrig, Westfield and Prideaux and five doctors of divinity - Featley, Hammond, Holdsworth, Sanderson and Morley - but of these only one or two attended, they having been forbidden to be present by the King. From the point of view of the accommodationists it is no exaggeration to say that this must be universally deplored. For here is our "might have been". Had these men but attended the chances of a compromise between Episcopacy and Presbytery would have been greatly enhanced, there undoubtedly being a most favourable atmosphere - an atmosphere whose pacific aims, assuredly, were intensified by the presence of John Dury, famous for his efforts to promote union among the Protestant churches in his "Model of Church Government". Ussher, indeed, may have been absent in body yet he was present in spirit - indeed, perhaps in the history of councils there never was a better example of a man who was not present swaying such influence in its deliberations.⁴ Many were his friends who were there and many who were influenced by him. Calamy, for example, was plainly a disciple as he was, too, of Davenant. Gataker was his friend, as, also, of Selden. The same can be said of Hoyle and of Gouge.⁵ Regarding Marshall, Baxter, speaking of his moderation, says - "If all the bishops had been of the same spirit as Archbishop Ussher, the Independents like Jeremiah Burroughs, and the Presbyterians like Mr. Stephen Marshall, the divisions of the church would soon have been healed".⁶ The friendly /

friendly disposition and moderate views of Reynolds may be assumed from the fact that later he accepted the bishopric of Norwich. Burgess and Arrowsmith, we may add, were under the spell of Ussher and had a liking for moderate Episcopacy - the same can be said of Twisse, Palmer and Temple. When, too, we recall that those bright stars of the accommodation movement, Tillotson and Stillingfleet, had received their education from masters who were members of the Westminster Assembly we need not wonder that the *via media* was an ideal which many present deeply cherished. While, too, it may be true that the Scottish commissioners and the five "Smectymnuans" advocated for Presbyterianism a *ius divinum*, a more liberal party, composed of Twisse, Gataker, Reynolds, Palmer and many others, was content with a *ius humanum* - a fact helpful to the accommodationists.

From the above account one might be pardoned for thinking that they were justified in holding high hopes - deep, deep, accordingly, must have been their disappointment when the Episcopalians absented themselves. The possibility of a Presbyterian-Episcopalian accommodation meanwhile just disappeared and in its stead we see the strange, projected accommodation of Presbyterians and Independents. ⁷ As we would expect, this was a failure too. Says Hetherington -

"Several meetings were held, and several papers framed by each party, but no approximation towards union appeared, both retaining their peculiar views, with little, if any modification. The last meeting took place on the 9th of March 1646, when very long and elaborate answers were produced by the members of Assembly to the opinions, reasonings, and requests of the Dissenting Brethren. After that the committee /

committee met no more, the controversy, so far as regarded debate and writing, terminated without any agreement; and the matter became a conflict of principle against intrigue and power." ⁸

The Presbyterian claim of a *ius divinum* made such an accommodation impossible. Nor was it to the liking of the House of Commons, a fact plain, surely, from its queries sent down to the Assembly on April 22, 1646 -

"1. Whether the congregational and presbyterial elderships appointed by ordinance of parliament, or any other congregational or presbyterial elderships, are *jure divino*, and by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ? and, whether any particular church-government be *jure divino*? and, what that government is?

2. Whether all the members of the said elderships, as members thereof, or which of them, are *jure divino*, and by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ?

3. Whether the classical, provincial, and national assemblies, all or any of them, and which of them, are *jure divino*, and by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ?

4. Whether appeals from congregational elderships to classical, provincial, and national assemblies, or any of them, and to which of them, are *jure divino*, and by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ? and, whether their powers upon such appeals are *jure divino*, and by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ?

5. Whether oecumenical assemblies are *jure divino*? and, whether there be appeals from any of the former assemblies to the said oecumenical *jure divino*, and by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ?

6. Whether by the word of God, the power of judging and declaring what are such notorious and scandalous offences, for which persons guilty thereof are to be kept from the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and of convening before them, trying, and actually suspending from the sacrament of the Lord's supper such offenders, is either in the congregational eldership, presbytery, or in any other eldership, congregation, or persons? and, whether such powers are in them only, or any of them, and in which of them *jure divino*, and by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ?

7. Whether there be any certain and particular rules expressed in the word of God to direct the elderships or presbyteries, congregations or persons, or any of them, in the exercise and execution of the powers aforesaid, and what are those rules?

8. Is there any thing contained in the word of God, that the supreme magistracy in a Christian state may not judge and determine what are the aforesaid notorious and scandalous offences, and the manner of suspension for the same; and in what particulars concerning the premises is the said supreme magistracy by the word of God excluded?

9. Whether the provision of commissioners to judge of scandals not enumerated (as they are authorized by the ordinance of parliament) be contrary to that way of government which Christ has appointed in his church? and, wherein are they so contrary?"⁹

To the answers to these questions the House of Commons required the scripture proofs to be appended - the whole object of such a captious and sophistic questionnaire, of course, being obvious - to proffer a veiled hostility to every degree and kind of spiritual jurisdiction, Selden's and Whitelocke's masterly hands being plainly visible. The object was to cause dissension, the plain truth being that the House of Commons was afraid to be fettered with the Scottish discipline. "They" (the Cromwellians), says Baxter, "were far from thinking of a moderate Episcopacy, or of any healing way between the Episcopal and the Presbyterians."¹⁰ Accommodation, accordingly, receded into the background. Is Marsden's verdict correct - that the Westminster Assembly was the "mere child of the Long Parliament; its toy at first, and then, as it grew fretful, its annoyance"?¹¹ Strange as it may seem, it was 'toleration' that eventually swamped 'accommodation' in the consideration and debates of the Assembly. "But their (the Independents') /

Independents') claim", says Professor A.F. Mitchell, "to be allowed to hold charges in the national Church, and yet to gather congregations out of other parishes and congregations within its bounds, was one that could not possibly be conceded, and to that they tenaciously adhered. Neither could their claim be granted to exclude from sealing ordinances without appeal, all in their parishes who, however credible their profession might be, or blameless their life, did not exhibit such evidence of a work of grace as to satisfy the congregation that they were truly regenerate persons. In this they had the Parliament more decidedly hostile to them than even the Assembly, and were the first to feel the effects of that Erastian interference which they had themselves rather encouraged. It was on this rock the scheme of accommodation was really and finally wrecked, according to their own confession, 'as the House had not thought meet as yet to give power by a law to purge the congregations, and as the rule for purging proposed by the Assembly was not only short but exclusive of what they thought was required in church members.' Gillespie, Henderson, Reynolds, and many others, would have yielded much to retain them within the reconstituted church, but this they could hardly yield without turning their backs on the National Reformed churches generally, and becoming in fact Independents themselves." ¹²

Such an accommodation could not be. Assuredly this is disappointing, the more especially as the two great parties coincided more nearly at that time than they have ever done since. The rock of toleration it was on which accommodation split.

XIX. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Mitchell and Struthers. p. xxvii.
Neal says -
"The majority at first intended only the reducing episcopacy to the standard of the first or second age, but for the sake of the Scots alliance, they were prevailed with to lay aside the name and function of bishops, and attempt the establishing a presbyterial form, which at length they advanced into jus divino, or a divine institution, derived expressly from Christ and his apostles."
History of the Puritans. Vol. III. p. 116.
2. Ecclesiastical History of England.
Vol. I. Church of the Civil Wars. p. 272.
3. The absence of the last three is discussed in Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Mitchell and Struthers. pp. xlii. & xliii.
cf. E.R.E. Article "Toleration" (W.F. Adeney).
Vol. XII. p. 364.
"Chillingworth affirms that Protestants are inexcusable if they do violence to the consciences of others. He holds it to be a great sin to force on other people our own interpretations of Scripture, arguing that this was the cause of all the schisms and discords of Christianity."
4. The Westminster Assembly. Baird Lecture for 1882.
A.F. Mitchell. p. 117.
cf. Hetherington. History of the Westminster Assembly. p. 118.
"Indeed there were many Episcopalians who had not embraced the high theory of Bancroft and Laud, otherwise none could have appeared in the Assembly at all."
5. The Westminster Assembly. Baird Lecture for 1882.
A.F. Mitchell. pp. 121-123.
Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Mitchell and Struthers. pp. xxxiv. - xxxvi.
6. Annals of English Presbytery.
Thomas M^r Crie. p. 154.
Baillie. Letters. Vol. II. pp. 110 & 111.
One of Burroughs' last sermons was entitled "Irenicum, or an Attempt to heal Divisions among Christians."
Baxter's account of the Solemn League and Covenant and the Westminster Assembly in this connection is interesting -
"This Covenant was proposed by the Parliament to the Consideration of the Synod at Westminster: The Synod stumbled at some things in it, and especially at the word (Prelacy.) Dr. Burges the Prolocutor, Mr. Gataker, /

Gataker, and abundance more declared their Judgments to be for Episcopacy, even for the ancient moderate Episcopacy, in which one stated President with his Presbytery, governed every Church; though not for the English Diocesan frame, in which one Bishop, without his Presbytery, did by a Lay-Chancellour's Court, govern all the Presbyters and Churches of a Diocess, being many hundreds; and that in a Secular manner by abundance of upstart Secular Officers, unknown to the Primitive Church. Hereupon grew some Debate in the Assembly; some being against every Degree of Bishops, (especially the Scottish Divines,) and others being for a moderate Episcopacy. But these English Divines would not subscribe the Covenant, till there were an alteration suited to their Judgments: and so a Parenthesis was yielded to, as describing that sort of Prelacy which they opposed, viz. (That is, Church Government by Arch-bishops, Bishops, Deans and Chapters, Arch-deacons, and all other Ecclesiastical Officers depending on that Hierarchy.) All which conjoyned are mentioned as the Description of that Form of Church Government which they meant by Prelacy, as not extending to the ancient Episcopacy."

Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part I. pp. 48 & 49.

7. Baillie. Letters. Vol. II. p. 147.
Lightfoot, xiii., 214-215, 229, 214.
Gillespie. Debates and Proceedings. p. 37.
8. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. pp. 255-261.
History of the Westminster Assembly. W.M. Hetherington.
p. 236.
9. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. pp. 253 & 254,
quoting Rushworth.
W.A. Shaw. A History of the English Church during the
Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth. 1640-1660.
Vol. I. pp. 306 & 307.
Hetherington. pp. 281 & 282.
10. Marsden. History of the Later Puritans. pp. 147 & 148.
11. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part I. p. 51.
12. History of the Later Puritans. p. 87.
The Westminster Assembly. Baird Lecture for 1882.
pp. 203 & 204.

IX.

THE ENGLISH ACCOMMODATIONIST THINKERS.

We are now drawing near the classical period of the Accommodationists. It may, therefore, not be inappropriate at this point to interpolate a chapter on their principal thinkers, together with a brief account of their thought and teaching. On page 22 of this work, it may be recalled, is the statement - "In England it (Episcopacy) rested on a theological basis . . . but in Scotland the claim for divine right never came to the surface." This, indeed, is true, a characteristic of England being the amount of sustained study that was put into the subject of church polity. For it was ever the proud boast of the Church of England that it was no mere offspring of the Reformation, that while, indeed, it was true to the New Testament, it was also in direct continuity with the Apostolic Church and the Church of the Fathers. It had thus the twofold feature of being governed by catholic principles and of being reformed.

[Says Hooker, for example -

"To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the church of Rome were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men, in that they are wise men and Christian men some things, some things in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow reason and truth, we fear not to tread the selfsame steps wherein they have gone, and to be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancients and better, others whom we much more affect leaving it for newer and changing it for worse, we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects resemble them whom we love."

S. ^{page 140}
The same line of argument could be illustrated from Cranmer, Jewel, Field, /

Field, Bramhall, Bull and many others. On principles such as these, argued the seventeenth century Anglicans, it was possible to rebut both Romanists and Puritans. Holding, too, a central position, they felt a certain kinship with both sides, afforded a home for men of varying convictions and - which is of interest to us - supplied a way of comprehension.

No doubt the claims made for Episcopacy differed in intensity from 'bene esse' to 'esse', this difference being of supreme importance to the accommodationists. Bancroft it is who is usually claimed as the first to maintain the *ius divinum*, but his language is not much stronger than that of Jewel and Whitgift. As against the Puritans his "Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline" was a strong polemic, as was also Bilson's "Perpetual Government of Christ's Church" which appeared in the same year - 1593. Of the two, the latter certainly contains the more scientific investigation. In answer to his Puritan opponents Bilson asserts -

"When St. Austin and St. Jerome do say that the church createth and placeth bishops in the apostles' seats, they do not mean, as you misconstrue their words, that the church both altered the form of the apostolic government which she received, and of herself devised another kind of regiment by bishops; that were to charge the church of Christ with a voluntary defection from the apostles' discipline, and an arrogant preferring of her own invention before God's ordinance. With which though some in our times can be content to challenge the whole church of Christ, and even the apostles' coadjutors and scholars, yet Augustine and Jerome were far from that humour. Their meaning is that albeit the apostles be departed this life, who were worthily accounted fathers, because they were called immediately by Christ himself to convert and congregate his church, yet the church is not destitute, for so much as she hath power from God to create and appoint other of her children in their places, which are bishops. 'Think not thyself forsaken', saith Austin to the church, 'because thou seest not Peter and Paul, by whom thou wast begotten: of thine own offspring
a /

a fatherhood is grown unto thee. Instead of the fathers, children are born unto thee; thou shalt make them rulers over the whole earth'. He saith not the bishops are strangers or intruders on the apostles' possession; but, they are lawful children and rightly placed in their fathers' rooms, whose heirs and successors they are, though their vocation be not immediate from God, as the apostles' was." ²

In the year after the publication of Bancroft's and Bilson's books viz:- 1594 appeared Richard Hooker's monumental work - "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity". Impossible it is to exaggerate the influence of this justly famous book. Admittedly, Hooker cannot be claimed as an accommodationist (Says Schaff - "Hooker has been claimed as a champion of the High-Anglican doctrine of episcopacy, and, hardly less confidently, by the other side as the advocate of the view that church government is a matter of expediency." See Schaff-Herzog.) - nevertheless, his book was ever an inspiration to the school. The famous eulogy of law, for example, in the first book is clearly reflected in the "Irenicum" of Stillingfleet - who, too, could proudly quote a writer so aptly called "the judicious". ³ It is, of course, possible to get the impression that Hooker stood for positions which effectively debarred accommodation. He does not speak too kindly of Presbyterianism, ⁴ (though he gave a generous and impartial appreciation of Calvin in his Preface) he claims Episcopacy to be in closest accord with scripture, ⁵ he rebuts parity. ⁶ The first bishops, too, he asserts, were the apostles, ⁷ and ordination was peculiar to the bishops. ⁸ Like so many sixteenth and seventeenth century Anglicans, such as Whitgift, Sutcliffe, Bancroft, Bilson, Crakanthorp, Davenant, Jeremy Taylor, Laud, /

Laud, Thorndike, Cosin, Pearson, Barrow and Potter, he is much perturbed by the heresy of Aerius.⁹ Nevertheless, Hooker's arguments, in the main, were such as to encourage the accommodationists. He combats, for example, the view that "Scripture is the only rule of all things which, in this life, may be done by men." While, too, admitting scripture to be an infallible guide, he denies that it is the only guide by which men are led. Reason has its place - as also the concurrent instruction of all the sources of knowledge Providence has put at man's command. He carries the war into the enemies' camp by his description of the results that would follow the extreme Puritan position.

"For in every action of common life to find out some sentence clearly and infallibly setting before our eyes what we ought to do (seem we in Scripture never to expert) would trouble us more than we are aware. In weak and tender minds we little know what misery this strict opinion would breed, besides the stops it would make in the whole course of all men's lives and actions."¹⁰

In the third book the author deals with the view "that in scripture there must be of necessity contained a form of Church polity, the laws whereof may in nowise be altered." Now, in answering this, he does not insist that the polity of the Church of England is contained in holy writ, the merit of his argument being that he refuses to allow scripture to be made a code strangling growth and reasonable freedom. Things not commanded in scripture, he says, may still be lawful - indeed, the practice of the Puritans themselves admitted it. Although he believes Episcopacy to be scriptural, he does not refuse to the Scottish and the French Reformed communions the title of churches. While, too, he argues, Episcopacy /

Episcopacy may be apostolic and by divine instinct there is nothing beyond the power of the catholic church to change it.

"The whole body of the church hath power to alter, with general consent and upon necessary occasions, even the positive laws of the apostles, if there be no command to the contrary and it manifestly appears to her that change of times have clearly taken away the very reasons of God's first institution Bishops, albeit they may avouch with conformity of truth that their authority hath thus descended even from the very apostles themselves, yet the absolute and everlasting continuance of it they cannot say that any commandment of the Lord doth enjoin, and therefore must acknowledge that the church hath power by universal consent upon urgent cause to take it away, if thereunto she be constrained through the proud, tyrannical, and unreformable dealings of her bishops, whose regiment she hath thus long delighted in." "

It is conceivable, Hooker argues, that local churches might have to act without bishops.¹²

It is plain, accordingly, that Hooker was not narrow in his outlook and that his broad generalisations encouraged the accommodationists in their endeavours. In a word - and in pursuit of our present study - Hooker's importance for us lies in the fact that he was the representative of toleration in the field of ecclesiastical polity and the advocate of reason as against a narrow scripturalism. Here, indeed, was good soil for the promoters of accommodation.

The two great names which connect the Elizabethan days with those of Charles I. are Andrewes and Overall. The former certainly claimed divine right for Episcopacy - nevertheless, he did not assert its indispensableness. Overall, on the other hand, claimed not only that the three orders were to be traced to divine inspiration, but the whole hierarchy.

Of more immediate interest, however, to our enquiry are the English divines of the Synod of Dort. The leader was Bishop Carleton who, however, from our point of view, calls for no special mention. The most eminent representative, undoubtedly, was Joseph Hall, then Dean of Worcester, whose "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted" was to set the claims of Episcopacy on a very high level, indeed - a scholar who knew how to use Clement and Ignatius to ^{what?} good effect. A moderate Calvinist, who sought for a mean between Calvinism and Arminianism - later, indeed, the author of a tract on the subject "Via media, the way of peace" - he yet did not show the same desire for a via media as regards church polity. All the same, for us the most interesting figure is Bishop John Davenant. In many ways a tolerant man - kindly, indeed, to the Puritans ¹³ - he yet made high claims in argument. For example, for him the question whether bishops and presbyters were a single order was a quibble, the bishop having the distinguishing notes of a unique authority, the power of ordination and a jurisdiction over clergy and laity.

"It is evident that Christ Himself, for the edification of His Church, constituted ministers not endued with equal authority, but distinct in degree of dignity and power. For the Twelve Apostles were superior to the Seventy Disciples, and were placed above the same, not in excellency of gifts alone, but in amplitude of authority and power. Moreover, it is the constant doctrine of nearly all the Fathers, that the bishops succeeded the apostles in the ordinary government of the Church, as the presbyters also succeeded the seventy disciples.

We assert that, before the apostles departed from earth to heaven, they placed in the great cities a Bishop, in authority superior to, and in power greater than the other presbyters. He was Chief Pastor of that city; he possessed a superiority, not only over the laity, but over the clergy or presbyters /

presbyters of the same city. Such was Titus at Crete, Timothy at Ephesus, James at Jerusalem, Euodias at Antioch, Amianus at Alexandria, Polycarp at Smyrna, not to mention others, who, it is most certain, were exalted to the Episcopal seat, the apostles being alive, and seeing, approving, nay, even directing, that very thing. It is also certain that, throughout the Universal Church of Christ, the successors of these also held a certain eminent authority over their own flock and over inferior ministers; and it is equally certain that there was a perpetual succession of the same." ¹⁴

Despite these claims, however, - and this is rather a puzzling fact - Davenant contrived to make himself an influence among the accommodationists. In his contribution to J. Durie's eirenicon, *De pace ecclesiastica inter evangelicos* (1634), he left, as Bishop Hall says (in his *Peacemaker*), "a Golden Tractate" as his legacy to Christendom. In a second treatise, included in the English translation of the *Exhortation to Brotherly Communion* (London, 1641), he treats as the three main difficulties the questions of (1) the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; (2) the Ubiquity of Christ's Humanity and "the communication of properties"; (3) Predestination and Free Will. ¹⁵ Notwithstanding these difficulties, acceptance of the Apostles' Creed, he felt, was a sufficient basis for communion, apparently not thinking the differences of Episcopalians and Presbyterians an insuperable difficulty.

But we must pass on, resisting the temptation to dwell on the wonderful galaxy of seventeenth century Anglicans, and confining ourselves to the names which have a bearing on our subject.

Jeremy Taylor, too, argued for Episcopacy on orthodox lines. His career in Ireland - it cannot be gainsaid - did nothing to give him a name for toleration - a curious commentary on the "Liberty /

"Liberty of Propheying" of 1647 - "in which, suffering from intolerance, he pleaded against it, and advocated a theory of comprehension which he had not the power to put in practice. It was, in fact, an eloquent plea on behalf of deprived Episcopal clergymen, based on principles broader than were sufficient to support their case alone, but which, when the tables were turned, he was not prepared to apply to Presbyterians." ¹⁶ All the same, the "Liberty of Propheying" was a real contribution to our subject, its plea - that the interference of the State should be exercised only when doctrines injurious to its own well-being were publicly taught - having a strong modern flavour.

It is, however, to the Restoration and the period thereafter, that we must look for the principal accommodationist thinkers. Mention, for example, must be made of George Morley, successively Bishop of Worcester and of Winchester - one of those who, most unfortunately, had declined to sit in the Westminster Assembly, who yet, however, had his place at the Savoy Conference. It is true that he laid himself open to the charge of intolerance by his advocacy of such a modification of the Test Act as should compel sworn allegiance to the Church of England - on the other hand, he was the friend of Falkland, and later of Izaak Walton, and had the reputation of being no extremist. Such was the man selected by Clarendon to send over to England in 1660 to negotiate - in view of the King's return - with the Presbyterian party - who was, indeed, ready to advocate a reduced Episcopacy, if nothing better could be obtained. ¹⁷

"I foresee, he wrote to Clarendon on May 4, 1660, the main difficulty will be touching their ordinations by presbyters without bishops, which we cannot acknowledge to be lawful, nor will they, I am afraid, be brought to acknowledge to be unlawful, and much less to be mere nullities. In this case I have thought of two expedients; the one that no notice be taken whether there have been any such ordinations or no; the other, that there may be an hypothetical reordination, by bishops, of such as were so ordained, which reordination, as it will be a provision against the nullity of such ordinations, so it will not conclude them to be nullities, but only irregular and uncertain. And this is much the better salvo of the two, if they can be brought to it." ¹⁸

The former expedient, it must be confessed, was doubtful morally, and the second, though attractive to many minds, not conscientiously acceptable.

Herbert Thorndike, we need not say, cannot be classed among the accommodationists, he being, as Stoughton asserts, "the most learned, the most systematic, and the most powerful advocate of Anglo-Catholic theology and High-Church principles in the seventeenth century." ¹⁹ Nevertheless, like Ussher and Baxter, he had decided views on the moderation of primitive Episcopacy. The primitive bishops were "heads of presbyteries" - the power of ordination resting in the apostles and the presbytery before there were bishops, and in the bishop and the presbytery in common afterwards - an arrangement which came to be altered. Bishops, indeed, were not to act without their presbyters - but neither, of course, could presbyters act without their bishops. ²⁰ These broad views might have made Thorndike highly favourable in the eyes of the accommodationists - nevertheless, it must be admitted, he had no liking for either Presbyterians or Independents. For all that, Thorndike /

Thorndike - an idealistic rather than a practical thinker - longed for unity and appealed for the holding of a conference.²¹

We must pass over the names of Bramhall and Cosin, the former - strictly speaking - belonging to our Irish section. Both, needless to say, adhered to Episcopacy along orthodox lines, yet each was willing to meet good Presbyterians halfway. At the Restoration, for example, the former would have gone as far as possible to conciliate those who had been employed under the Presbyterian regime.

"Some, we are told, had no other but their certificates of ordination by some presbyterian classes, which, he told them, did not qualify them for any preferment in the church. Upon this the question arose, 'Are we not ministers of the gospel?' To which his Grace answered, 'That was not the question'; at least he desired for peace sake, that might not be the question for this time. 'I dispute not', said he, 'the value of your ordination, nor those acts you have exercised by virtue of it; what you are, or might be, here when there was no law, or in other churches abroad. But we are now to consider ourselves as a national church limited by law, which among other things takes chief care to prescribe about ordination; and I do not know how you could recover the means of the church, if any should refuse to pay you your tithes, if you are not ordained as the law of this church requireth; and I am desirous that she may have your labours, and you such portions of your revenue as shall be allotted you, in a legal and assured way.' By this means he gained such as were learned and sober."²²

As regards Cosin, Calamy relates an expedient to which the bishop was ready to resort in his endeavour to win over a Presbyterian called Frankland.

"Bishop Cosin solicited him to conform, promising him not only his living, but greater preferment upon his compliance. Mr. Frankland told him that his unwillingness to renounce his ordination by presbyters made him incapable of enjoying the benefit of his favour. This engaged him in a debate with the bishop, that was managed with great calmness, and this was the result of it. His lordship condescended to /

to ask whether he would be content to receive a new ordination so privately that the people might not know of it, and have it conditionally, with such words as these, 'if thou hast not been ordained, I ordain thee' etc. He thanked him, but told him he durst not yield to the proposal, at the same time assuring his lordship, that it was not obstinacy, but conscience, which hindered his compliance." ²³

These "if" ordinations had a certain attraction for some seventeenth century minds - as, for example, Tillotson's. All the same, it is astonishing to see Cosin - an Anglo-Catholic - employing it. From the point of view of the accommodationists, however, the attitude of Bramhall and Cosin is interesting.

Timothy Puller who, in 1679, published his "Moderation of the Church of England" next commands our attention. This writer never ceased to emphasize the lenity of his church - which stood, he said, midway between ecclesiastical monarchy and Presbyterian democracy ²⁴ - to the dissenters.

"In confuting opinions our church always spares the persons, how severe so ever she is upon the error; because in the divisions of hearts that are in the world, it is certain some good may dissent. So moderate also and just is our church, she is far from deterring others from her communion by branding any with the note of heresy, unless upon just reason and cause, distinguishing also between a heretic and those who are by heretics seduced." ²⁵

The Church of England is -

"the best and most proper for arbitrating and reconciling the present differences of Christendom; . . . neither will any, I hope, have the worse opinion of our church, because Grotius thought the church of England 'a right medium of reconciliation', whose 'pacificatory design' Mr. Baxter took to be 'one of the most blessed noble works that any man can be employed in.'" ²⁶

Puller's affinities with Baxter cannot fail to be noted in our present investigation. Herbert Croft, Bishop of Hereford, in

1675 with his "The Naked Truth" gave the point of view - as we would say to-day - of the man in the street, his name for him, however, being "an humble moderator". Many were his concessions, including the surrender of all contested rites and ceremonies.

"Yet I cannot by any means consent to them who would have episcopacy to be a distinct order, nor can I think the ordination of a priest made by priests invalid; for though it ought not to be done, but only of necessity, yet being done 'tis valid, and certainly may, without any crime, by any priest by shipwreck or any such chance cast into a country where there were none commissioned to ordain Doubtless to ordain out of order is better than no ordination Yet where order can possibly be observed, it ought to be; for God is the God of order." ²⁷

These are concessions indeed - from one, too, who had been a Jesuit.

Archbishop Sancroft is of interest to us as apparently the first Anglican to confer on the Protestant bodies in England the title "Reformed Churches". He was, however, very friendly in his attitude to the Protestant dissenters. Indeed, we can even claim him as of the number of the accommodationists, he being the author of a tentative comprehension, the details of which have been preserved to us by his biographer, George D'Oyley.

"The design was in short this: to improve and if possible amend our discipline; to review and enlarge our liturgy, by correcting some things, by adding others, and omitting some few ceremonies so as not to make them of necessity binding on those who had conscientious scruples respecting them And if things alterable be altered upon the grounds of prudence and charity, whilst the doctrine, government, and worship of the church remain entire in all the substantial parts of them, we have all reason to believe that this will be so far from injuring the church, that on the contrary it will receive a great benefit from it." ²⁸

But little came of this, Sancroft's character not being such as to beget /

beget it any popularity - "a dry, cold man, reserved, and peevish, so that none loved him, and few esteemed him", says Burnet.^{29.}

We now come to the great names of Tillotson, Stillingfleet and Baxter - the last two, in particular, being brilliant stars in the constellation of the accommodationists. By this time, of course, the ideal of one English Church had had to be abandoned. No doubt the nonconformists, such as Baxter himself, consistently refused to create a schism, yet the separatists as a body had no such qualms. Toleration, therefore, had perforce to be the national policy - both church and state putting up with the existence of other religious communities besides the church. Nevertheless, the old ideal persisted - hence a crop of comprehension schemes and a golden age of accommodationists.

In many ways Tillotson was well suited to act as one of their number. True - he has studied at Clare Hall, Cambridge^{30.} - a home of Puritanism - yet, personally, he leaned to the latitudinarian school.^{31.} The Cambridge Platonist school, too, including Cudworth, More, Smith and Wilkins exercised no small influence over him^{32.} - as did also Chillingworth. Actually, he appeared on the Presbyterian side at the famous Savoy Conference, though too young to take part in that assembly, and later, submitting to the Act of Uniformity of 1662. His ordination is rather a mystery but Tillotson, a prince of preachers,^{33.} wielded an extraordinary influence. Says Burnet - "He was the man of the truest judgment and best temper I had ever known: he had a clear head, with a most tender /

tender and compassionate heart: he was a faithful and zealous friend, but a gentle and soon conquered enemy: he was truly and seriously religious, but without affectation, bigotry, or superstition: his notions of morality were fine and sublime: his thread of reasoning was easy, clear, and solid: he was not only the best preacher of the age, but seemed to have brought preaching to perfection."³⁴ Like many of the accommodationists, of course, Tillotson was often misrepresented but was invariably patient and unresentful. "His tender method of treating with Dissenters", says Birch, his biographer, "and his endeavours to unite all Protestants amongst themselves, were represented as a want of zeal in the cause of the church, and an inclination towards those, who departed from it. But how unhappily successful soever they might be in infusing these jealousies of him into some warm and unwary men, he still persever'd in his own way. He would neither depart from his moderation, nor take pains to cover himself from so false an imputation."³⁵ Tillotson, then, with such a varied experience of many schools of thought, was well fitted to take his place among the accommodationists - the description of whose accommodations, however, we shall reserve to its proper place.

And now, despite the detractions of some,³⁶ it is with the utmost reverence and appreciation that we come to the name of Edward Stillingfleet, one of the very greatest of the accommodationists, whose "Irenicum. A Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds. Or the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church-Government; Discussed and examined according to the Principles of /

of the Law of Nature, the positive Laws of God, the practice of the Apostles and the Primitive Church, and the judgement of Reformed Divines. Whereby a foundation is laid for the Churches peace, and the accommodation of our present differences." published in 1659, with a second edition in 1662, was for long a text-book of the accommodationists. He was one of Burnet's Latitudinarians,³⁷ was under the influence of the Cambridge Platonists, especially John Smith, was an excellent preacher of the essay-like type of sermon, with many characteristics of his own. His style was flowing and lucid, free from rhetorical aid, making good use of illustration and of classical quotation, orderly to a degree. His style, indeed -

"suggests always the lawn sleeves of the bishop or the pulpit of a university; it conveys the impression of being in full dress, and suggests brilliant auditories and outstanding occasions, and for this reason it lacks the familiarity of manner that is acceptable to the solitary reader, or the lowering of tone that is agreeable to the closet."³⁸

And now, let us turn to a brief account of the argument of this deservedly famous book. In his preface the author bewails the controversies of his day.

"For our Controversies about Religion have brought at last even Religion itself into a Controversie, among such whose weaker judgements have not been able to discern where the plain and unquestionable way to heaven hath layn, in so great a Mist as our Disputes have raised among us."³⁹

His aim he declares to be -

"to shew that there can be no argument drawn from any pretence of a Divine Right, that may hinder men from consenting and yeilding to such a form of Government in the Church, as may bear the greatest correspondency to the Primitive Church, and be most advantageously conduceable to the peace, unity, and settlement of our divided Church."⁴⁰

The things necessary for the Church's peace, he says, must be clearly revealed. It is not so, however, with the form of church government, otherwise there would not be the present controversies. Apparently, then, Christ never intended any one form as the only means to peace in the church.

What, at any rate, is the nature of divine right? Right makes things either lawful or due, for the former a non-prohibition being sufficient, while for the latter express commands are required. What is the position as regards church government? Obviously, it is founded on the Law of Nature which is shown by such propositions as these - there must be a society of men for the worship of God, such a society requires to be governed in the most convenient manner, man being of a sociable nature and needing the improvement of religion. Further, according to Stillingfleet, the Law of Nature issues in a set of important truths - the superiority of some persons over others, for example, in power and order, the fact, too, that persons employed in the service of God must have respect answerable to their employments, the solemnity, also, of all rites and ceremonies - in addition, the necessity of a way to end controversies (this leading to a discussion of schism), the binding duty of those who are members of the church to abide by its laws and, finally, the necessity of offenders against such laws giving an account to their governors.

This brings us to the second part of the Irenicum. Hitherto, the argument has been somewhat philosophical and abstract - now, however, facing the question of Positive Laws, our author is more concrete /

concrete and interesting. Has Christ actually determined the form of government by positive laws? To this highly important question he does not hesitate to reply in the negative.

"But with all I acknowledge, that Christ for the better Government of his Church and people, hath appointed officers in his Church, invested them by vertue of his own power with an authority to preach and baptize, and administer all Gospel ordinances in his own name, that is by his authority; for it is clearly made known to us in the word of God, that Christ hath appointed these things. But then, whether any shall succeed the Apostles in superiority of power over presbyters, or all remain governing the Church in an equality of power, is nowhere determined by the will of Christ in Scripture, which contains his Royal Law: and therefore we have no reason to look upon it as any thing flowing from the power and authority of Christ as mediator; and so not necessarily binding Christians." ⁴¹

Ius Divinum will simply not do. ⁴²

The author, however, is not perturbed by the apparent uncertainty. It applies - without, it seems, any prejudicial effects - in many other departments of Christian life and thought - in questions as to the desirability or not of baptizing children, as to whether baptism be by dipping or sprinkling, as to whether participants at Communion be admitted by previous external examination or solely by personal desire, as to whether they partake kneeling, sitting or leaning, as to what form preaching, praying and singing should take - and so on. Positive law gives no guidance.

Further, it has to be remembered that the early church was a growing institution - how was it possible to set one form of government for what was merely in the beginning of an unknown evolution?

is / "And this is the chief reason why the Churches Polity

is so little described in the New Testament, because it was only growing then: and it doth not stand to reason, that the coat which was cut out for one in his infancy, must of necessity serve him when grown a man; which is the argument of those who will have nothing observed in the Church, but what is expressed in Scripture. The Apostles looked at the present state of a Church in appointing officers, and ordered things according to the circumstances of them, which was necessary to be done in the founding of a Church; and the reason of Apostolical practice binds still, though not the individual action, that as they regulated Churches for the best conveniency of Governing them, so should the Pastors of Churches now." ⁴³

Plain, therefore, it is that a very considerable liberty is accorded the Church.

"But methinks, these general orders and rules for discipline do imply the particular manner of government to be left at liberty to the Church of God, so that in all the several forms these general rules be observed. Whereas had Christ appointed a superior order to govern other subordinate officers and the Church together; Christs command for governing the Church would have been particularly addressed to them: and again, had it been the will of Christ there should be no superior order above the Pastours of particular Churches, there would have been some express and direct prohibition of it; which because we nowhere read, it seems evident that Christ hath left both the one and the other to the freedom and liberty of his Church."

The concluding part of the Irenicum is of fascinating interest because in it Stillingfleet carefully examines history with the purpose of corroborating his theory. He rebuts, for example, the idea that the apostles had provinces allotted them and that Peter was "Monarch of the Church." He favours, however, the view that church polity was largely influenced by the constitution of the Jewish Synagogue.

"It is probable that the Synagogue form of Government was used by the Christians. And the suitableness of this Government to the Churches, lay in the conveniency of it for the attaining all ends of Government in that condition wherein the Churches were at that time." ⁴⁵

Stillingfleet attacks the evidence adduced to demonstrate the superiority of bishops to presbyters. For example, in one passage he says -

"And among all those fifteen testimonies produced by a learned Writer out of Jerome for the superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, I cannot find one that doth found it upon any divine right, but only upon the conveniency of such an order for the peace and unity of the Church of God."

Indeed, the facile way in which so many Anglicans spoke of the "testimony of the Fathers", and appealed to this infallible evidence as though it were easily obtained and invariably pointed one way, obviously annoyed our author.⁴⁷ His own findings were very different -

"I do as yet despair of finding any one single testimony in all antiquity, which doth in plain terms assert Episcopacy, as it was settled by the practice of the Primitive Church in the ages following the Apostles, to be of an unalterable divine right."⁴⁸

The author then discusses the evolution of church government in the post-apostolic age, and has no difficulty in showing there was no one settled form.⁴⁹ The final division of the Irenicum gives an account of the judgment of the Reformed divines - English and foreign - a most interesting portion of the work, indeed, wherein he asserts that never did they conceive of any one form of church polity as being altogether necessary and indispensable. With the voice of appeal it is that Stillingfleet brings his memorable work to an end.

"That Form of Government is the best according to principles of Christian Prudence which comes the nearest to Apostolical practice, and tends most to the advancing the peace and unity of the Church of God. What that Form is, I presume not to define and determine, but leave it to be gather'd from /

from the evidence of Scripture and Antiquity, as to the Primitive practice, and from the nature, state, and condition of that Church wherein it is to be settled, as to its tendency to the advancement of peace and unity in it. In order to the finding out of which, that proposal of his late most excellent Majesty of glorious memory, is most highly just and reasonable. His Majesty thinketh it well worthy the studies and endeavours of Divines of both opinions, laying aside emulation and private interests, to reduce Episcopacy and Presbyterie into such a well-proportion'd Form of superiority and subordination, as may best resemble the Apostolical and Primitive times, so far forth as the different condition of the times, and the exigences of all considerable circumstances will admit.

If this proposal be embraced, as there is no reason why it should not; then, all such things must be retrieved which were unquestionably of the Primitive practice, but have been grown out of use through the length and corruption of times."⁵⁰

Such, then, is the Irenicum, a work so astonishing in its grasp and learning that it seems well-nigh incredible that it was the product of a man but twenty-four years of age.⁵¹ Owing, however, to its importance I have deemed it imperative to give some brief account of its general argument. It is only fair to add that the author, according to some, in later years modified - if, indeed, he did not actually retract - some of his positions. This, however, appears only to have been temporary.⁵²

Baxter, the last of our group of accommodationists, I reserve to the next chapter.

XX. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Hooker. Book V. xxviii. I. Works. Vol. II. Keble's Ed. Revised by Church and Paget. p. 127.
of. Crakanthorp e.g. who repudiated "Calvinist", "Lutheran", "Puritan" all alike when applied to the Church of England. (Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae).
2. Perpetual Government. Ed. 1842. p. 356.
3. The Irenicum. Stillingfleet. p. 190.
4. Book III. x. 8. Works. Vol. I. pp. 390 & 391.
5. Book III. xi. 16. Works. Vol. I. p. 409.
of. Book VII. i. 4. Works. Vol. III. p. 143.
6. Book III. xi. 20. Works. Vol. I. pp. 413 & 414.
7. Book VII. iv. 3. Works. Vol. III. p. 153.
8. Book VII. vi. 3. Works. Vol. III. p. 169.
The power of ordination was a crucial test - the school of Hall, Overall, Mason and Davenant reserving it for the bishops but others, such as Field, Thorndike and Andrewes, taking rather a broader view.
See e.g. Ollard and Crosse. Dictionary of English Church History. p. 223.
9. Book VII. ix. 2, 4. Works. Vol. III. pp. 201 & 203.
10. Book II. viii. 7. Works. Vol. I. p. 335.
of. J.R. Green. Short History of the English people. "He abandoned the narrow ground of Scriptural argument to base his conclusions on the general principles of moral and political science, on the eternal obligations of natural law. The Presbyterian system rested on the assumption that an immutable rule for human action, in all matters relating to religion, to worship, and to the discipline and constitution of the Church, was laid down, and only laid down, in Scripture. Hooker urged that a Divine order exists, not in written revelation only, but in the moral relations, and the social and political institutions of men. He claimed for human reason the province of determining the laws of this order; of distinguishing between what is changeable and unchangeable in them, between what is eternal and what is temporary in Scripture itself. It was easy for him to push on to the field of theological controversy which Cartwright had chosen, to show historically that no form of Church government had ever been of indispensable obligation, and that ritual observances had in all ages been left to the discretion of Churches, and determined by the differences of times."
Everyman Ed. p. 440.
11. Book VII. v. 8. Works. Vol. III. pp. 164 & 165.
12. Book VII. xiv. 11. Works. Vol. III. pp. 230 & 231.
13. The Life of Bishop Davenant. Morris Fuller. p. 59.
14. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. II. p. 427.

14. From "Diversity of Degrees." Morris Fuller.
The Life of Bishop Davenant. pp. 206, 207 & 208.
15. Life of Davenant. Fuller. p. 508.
16. Stoughton in Schaff-Herzog. Vol. IV. p. 2305.
17. Clarendon State Papers. Vol. III. p. 727.
cf. Burnet. History of His Own Time.
"He was a Calvinist with relation to the Arminian points, and was thought a friend to the puritans before the wars: but he took care after his promotion to free himself from all suspicions of that kind." One Vol. Ed. 1883. p. 120.
18. Clarendon State Papers. Vol. III. p. 738.
19. Stoughton in Schaff-Herzog. Vol. IV. p. 2358.
"He was one of the best scholars and mathematicians of this age."
John Aubrey. Brief Lives. 1669-1696.
Edited Andrew Clark. Vol. II. p. 257.
20. Primitive Government of Churches. Works. Ed. 1844.
Vol. I.
21. Works. Vol. I. p. 631.
22. Works. Vol. I. p. xxiv.
23. Calamy's Abridgement. Vol. II. p. 286.
24. Moderation of the Church of England. p. 193.
25. Do. p. 246.
26. Do. p. 248.
27. Naked Truth. p. 48.
cf. Burnet. History of His Own Time.
"Crofts was a warm devout man, but of no discretion in his conduct." One Vol. Ed. 1883. p. 174.
28. Life of Sancroft. George D'Oyley. Ed. 2. pp. 197 seq.
29. History of His Own Time. Burnet. One Vol. Ed. 1883.
p. 262.
30. English Pulpit Oratory. From Andrewes to Tillotson.
W. Fraser Mitchell. pp. 333 & 334.
31. Do. pp. 336 & 337.
32. The Cambridge Platonists. F.J. Powicke. p. 198.
33. Mitchell. English Pulpit Oratory. p. 323.
Tillotson. - "A 'latitudinarian' who rose as much through the pulpit as through politics to be archbishop of Canterbury." p. 303.
"Tillotson's style is simple and easy, in comparison with much that was written in his day; but it is utterly without charm, or distinction, or interest."
p. 303.
Cambridge History of English Literature. Vol. VIII.
ch. xii. Divines of the Church of England.
W.H. Hutton.
"Simon Patrick, Edward Stillingfleet and Tillotson - all three members of the episcopal order, while the last named was, perhaps, the most popular preacher in his day - contributed powerfully to the whole movement." (Latitudinarianism). p. 292.
ch. xi. Platonists and Latitudinarians.
J. Bass Mullinger, M.A.

34. Burnet. History of His Own Time. One Vol. Ed. 1883.
p. 605.
35. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. Thomas Birch, M.A. MDCCLII.
p. 31.
See also Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV.
p. 304.
36. e.g. Edmund Gosse. Eighteenth Century Literature. p. 101.
"Stillingfleet ended as Bishop of Worcester; he was a very learned man, but haughty and quarrelsome in disposition. He disputed angrily, not with other divines only, but with Dryden and with Locke; his miscellaneous theological writings collected in 1710, are exceedingly numerous, and some of them display a real genius for effective polemic. Stillingfleet was so charming in face and figure that he was called 'the beauty of holiness.'"
cf. Anthony Wood's incidental tribute - in one paragraph, to Tillotson and Stillingfleet is touching.
"July 10, M., Mr. John Fairclough vulgo Featly, a non-conforming minister, was buried in the fanaticall buriall place neare the Artillery yard London. 500 persons accompanied him to his grave, among whome Dr. (John) Tillotson and (Edward) Stillingfleet and other conformable ministers were present."
Life and Times of Anthony Wood. 1632-1695. Described by Himself. Andrew Clark, M.A. 4 Vols. Oxford Historical Society. 1891-95.
37. Burnet. History of His Own Time. One Vol. Ed. 1883.
p. 129.
A Supplement to Burnet's History of His Own Time. Edited by H.C. Foxcroft. MDCCCII.
"Doctor Stillingfleet gave an astonishing proof of his great capacity and how he can make himself master of any argument." p. 102.
"I grew well acquainted with Tillotson and Stillingfleet, who were then the most eminent of the young clergy, Whitscot and Wilkins were very free with me, and I easily went into the notions of the Latitudinarians."
p. 463.
38. Mitchell. English Pulpit Oratory. p. 306.
cf. Cambridge History of English Literature. Vol. VIII. ch. xii. Divines of the Church of England.
W.H. Hutton.
Stillingfleet - "His style entirely lacked the distinction which could make it permanent." p. 301.
"Burnet commended him to William III. as 'the learnedst man of his age in all respects' - a description justified by his Origines Sacrae (1662), and Origines Britannicae (1685)." p. 301.
"Stillingfleet's writing has no exceptional merit as literature." p. 300.
Both Pepys and Evelyn testify to the popularity of Stillingfleet's preaching. See their diaries.

39. Irenicum. Preface.
 40. Do.
 41. Do. p. 177. Also pp. 153 & 230.
 42. Do. Preface. Also p. 287.
 43. Do. pp. 180 & 181.
 44. Do. pp. 188 & 189. Also pp. 9 & 10.
 45. Do. p. 260. Also pp. 248 & 251.
 46. Do. p. 277. Also p. 288 seq.
 47. Do. See the cases of Ignatius and Tertullian.
 pp. 306, 309 & 310.
 48. Do. p. 314.
 49. Do. Chapter VII.
 50. Do. p. 417.
 Ussher is highly praised in the Preface.
 51. "It must be acknowledged by all, that it contains a Mass
 of Learning abundantly beyond what could have been
 expected at his years, and which few, if any of his
 contemporaries, could pretend to equal."
 Works of Dr. Stillingfleet. In six volumes.
 MDCCLX. Vol. I. p. 4.
 52. Article "Stillingfleet" in Schaff-Herzog. Vol. IV.
 p. 2249.
 D.N.B. Article "Stillingfleet" (W.H. Hutton). Vol. LIV.
 p. 375.
 Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 464.
 Neal's account of the Irenicum is given in Vol. IV.
 p. 284 seq. "If the doctor had steadily adhered to
 these principles, he could hardly have subscribed the
 act of uniformity next year, much less have written
 so warmly against the dissenters, as he did twenty
 years afterward."
 Baxter's Works. William Orme. Vol. I. p. 628.

BAXTER'S EFFORT - THE VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS.

The last of our present group of accommodationists is Richard Baxter, one of the very greatest of the school, one, indeed, whose name was to dominate the comprehension movements for many a day. Technically a Presbyterian - and so described by the Dictionary of National Biography - he was invariably, we know, an Anglican at heart - a combination, however, which makes him all the more interesting in our study. A practical man of affairs, too, deeply immersed in the historic events of his time, he was, in addition, a mystic and theologian. Indeed, of seventeenth century figures it was, perhaps, Baxter who came nearest to advocating the fundamental requirements of a real and lasting union. A prolific writer, also, his works were so numerous as to make him the veritable Origen of his day. For our purpose, however, the most interesting are - Catholic Unity; or the Only Way to Bring us all to be of One Religion, London, 1660; The Cure of Church Divisions, 3rd Edition, London, 1670; Church Concord, written 1667, published 1691; and Saint's Everlasting Rest, 1649-1650. In addition, is the inimitable Reliquiae Baxterianae - beloved of Coleridge and Samuel Johnson. From these books an interesting study it is to cull our author's position and teaching.

"The true unity of the Catholic Church consisteth in this, that they have all one Sanctifying spirit within them." ¹

"It is the Spirit of Holiness that is the uniting principle." ²

"There can be no true Christian Unity but in Christ the Redeemer and Head of the Church."

"The true members of the Church are built on the foundation of the Apostles and the Prophets."

"There is no true Christian Unity, but with the Holy Catholic Church. The body is but one. I Cor. 12: 12-13, Eph. 4: 4. But the unsanctified are not of the Holy Catholic Church, but only in the visible external communion."

"Let us first agree in all those points that Papists and Protestants, Calvinists and Lutherans, Armenians and Anabaptists, and Separatists, and all parties that deserve to be Christians are agreed in."

Personal holiness, indeed, with Baxter is indispensable. "If we ever agree and unite", he writes, "it must be on terms that are possible But it is impossible for us to come to you and to unite with you." From the context it is evident that the reason for this impossibility was simply that he held those outside his fold to be without the Spirit of Holiness, or the Uniting Principle. Our author's passionate desire for accommodation comes out in the Preface to the "Saint's Everlasting Rest" -

"As to the Difference in way of Government between the Moderate Presbyterians, Independents, Episcopal and Erastian, I make no doubt that if men's spirits stood not at a greater distance than their Principles they would quickly be united. But of all the four sorts there are some that run so high in their principles that they run out of Peace and Truth. Will God never put it into the hearts of Rulers to call together some of the most Godly, Learned, Moderate, and Peaceable of all four opinions (not too many), to agree upon a way of union and accommodation, and not to cease until they have brought it to this Issue - to come as near together as they can possibly in their Principles; and where they cannot, yet to unite as far as may be in their Practices, though on different Principles; and, where that cannot be, yet to agree on the most lovable peaceable course in the way of carrying on our different Practices; that so (as Rup. Meldenius saith), we may have Unity in things necessary, Liberty in things unnecessary, and Charity in all? The Lord persuade those who have the power to this Pacificatory enterprise without Delay."

There is, of course, an excellent basis of agreement and on this Baxter loves to dwell, the items - in summary - being these:- 1. Only one God. 2. God is our only happiness. 3. Sin hath made us miserable. 4. The Holy Ghost is the Sanctifier of God's elect. 5. The Holy Scripture is the Word of God. 6. There is a Heaven for the sanctified. 7. There is a Hell. 8. The flesh is our enemy and must be mortified. 9. Sin is the most hateful thing. 10. One thing is needful, we must seek first the Kingdom of God.⁸

The mystic, however, is practical in the way he grapples with the difficulties. He faces the problem of Episcopal and non-Episcopal ordination, also that of the validity of the Sacraments of Baptism, and of the Lord's Supper when administered by Pastors who were never Episcopally ordained. As regards non-Episcopal ordination Baxter declares to be a superstition the belief that "all the Pastors of the Protestant Churches abroad, who had only the election of the people and the ordination of Parochial Pastors, and not of Diocesan Bishops, are not true Ministers of Christ, but Lay-men That therefore their baptism is unlawful, and a nullity, and all those nations are not baptized Christians. (Though the Papists who hold the validity of Lay-men's baptizing do here censure more easily.)"⁹ "That it is not lawful to communicate in such Churches, and receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper from such Ministers That those countries which are baptized by such should be re-baptized That those ministers who are ordained by such should be re-ordained."¹⁰ Each of the foregoing /

foregoing declarations, be it noted, Baxter declared to be a "Superstition."

In a "Premonition" at the beginning of his "The True and Only Way of Concord of All the Christian Churches", (1680) - as also in his "Five Disputations" - Baxter makes it plain that, while he writes that Diocesan Prelacy, Archbishops, and Patriarchs are not to be made necessary to universal or subordinate Church Concord, he does not speak against the lawfulness of all Episcopacy. He then makes reference to Ignatius and to what he had to say with regard to Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. He states that he will not meddle with the question whether these should have Archbishops over them, or whether Patriarchs, Diocesans, and Lay Chancellors should be had as officers of Kings.

Such an echo of Leighton do we have here!

Not the least interesting part of Baxter's study, assuredly, is his treatment of schism which he defines as "an unlawful separating from one, or many churches, or making Parties and Divisions in them." These, he says, are caused -

"1. by unskilful, proud Church-Tyrants, Dogmatists, or superstitious Persons, by departing from Christ's instituted terms of Concord, the Christian Purity and Simplicity, and denying Communion to those that unite not on their sinful or unnecessary self-devised terms, and obey not their ensnaring Canons or Wills; or malignantly forbidding what Christ hath commanded, and excommunicating and persecuting men for obeying him.

2. or else by erroneous proud self-conceited persons, that will not unite and live in Communion upon Christ's instituted terms, but feigning some Doctrine or Practice of their own devising to be true, good, and necessary, which is not; or something to be intolerably simple that is good and lawful, do therefore cast off their Guides, and the Communion of the Church as unlawful, on pretence of choosing a better necessary way." "

As against such schism Baxter preached the wisdom of - "In necessariis unitas, in non-necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas."

Further, he taught that unity is promoted by -

"1. the Light of Reason and Sacred Truth adapted to the Understandings of the people and seasonably proposed with good advantage to convince them.

2. the Love of Pastors, Rulers and Dissenters, heaping coals of Fire on their heads.

3. the Power of Magistrates, encouraging men of Truth, Piety and peace, and restraining men from propagating intolerable errors and all sorts from violating the Laws of Humanity, Christian Sobriety, and Charity, and the publick peace."^{12.}

Negatively, Baxter is interesting in his narrative of the ways by which unity will assuredly not come - "the Papacie",^{13.} for example. The Universal Church, too, he believed would never unite under Patriarchs, or any other 'human form' of Church Government. No form is iure divino - Dr. Edward Reynolds, the late Bishop of Norwich, and Dr. Stillingfleet, he declared, held a similar opinion.^{14.}

The ways of futile hope he continued^{15.} -

"in many pretended Articles of Faith, not proved to be Divine: nor in owning unnecessary doubtful Opinions or Practices as Religions, or Worship of God; notwithstanding the pretence of Tradition."^{16.} "The Universal Church will never unite by receiving all that is now received by Greeks, Latines, Armenians, Abassines, Lutherans, Calvinists, Diocesans, Presbyterians Independents, Erastians, Anabaptists, or in full Conformity to any of the present Parties, which addeth to the Primitive Simplicity in her terms of Communion or Concord."^{17.} "The pretended Necessity of an uninterrupted Canonical or Episcopal Ordination will never unite the Church, but is Schismatical."^{18.} "The severity and force of Magistrates" will never procure unity.^{19.} "Any one uncertain doctrine, oath, covenant, profession, subscription, /

subscription, imposed will divide." ^{20.} "Unlimited toleration will divide." ^{21.} "The Catholick Church will never unite in a reception and Subscription to every Word, Verse, or Book of the Holy Scripture, as it now is in any one Translation, or in any one Copy of the Original now known." ^{22.} "The Catholick Church will never unite in subscribing to any men's whole Commentaries on the Bible." ^{23.}

Baxter's passion for union was dictated by no low or expedient or merely political motive - how modern, for example, he is in his plea for the missionary motive -

"an earnest desire of the world's Conversion, and of bringing in the barbarous, ignorant, infidels, and impious, to the knowledge of Christ, and a holy life, doth show a large degree of charity, and of the Unity of the Spirit, which would fain bring in all men to the bond of the same Unity and participation of the same spirit." ^{24.}

Such, in outline, are our author's ideas. Surely no one studied the subject more than he. How imposing, for example, is his list of those who were the subject of his enquiries - Erasmus, Cassander, Wicelius, Melanchthon, Musculus, Bucholzer, Junius, J.G. Vossius, Camero, Luyovious Capellus, Placaenus, Testardus, Amyraldus, Blondell, Dallaeus, the Breme and British Danes at Dort; Calixtus and his associates; Johann Bergius, Conrad Bergius, Ludov. Crocius, Iselburge, Ussher, Hall, Davenant, Ward, Preston, Whately, Fenner, Chillingworth, and many more. But before all he places John Dury and Mr. Le Blanke. ^{25.}

We now come to his practical effort in 1652 - the period of the Commonwealth, to which our narrative now brings us. For five years after the death of Charles I. ecclesiastical discipline in England was in suspension. There was no authority, for example, to decide on the qualifications of candidates for the ministry or
on /

on the titles by which men held benefices.²⁶ From December, 1653 to September, 1658 Cromwell was the governor of England in a sense even more absolute than Charles I., and the arbiter of religion in a manner almost more autocratic than Laud. During that time, certainly, he twice voluntarily accepted a limitation upon his power of a written constitution. In the Instrument of Government, for instance, his religious ideal was clearly set forth - a national profession of Christianity was to be maintained, teachers were to be appointed, no religious compulsion was to be used, liberty of Christian worship (provided, however, no civil injury was incurred by others) was to be granted.²⁷ In the later Humble Petition and Advice, too, by which the Protectorate was intended to be made permanent and hereditary in the year 1657, these provisions were in substance reaffirmed.²⁸ No recognition of any church was to exist, no enforcement of any system of discipline or worship. Independency, indeed, practically became the religion of England, without the actual abolition of the Presbyterian formularies recognized by law. Toleration there was to be for all - slaves of Popish and Episcopal superstition and moral turpitude excepted - who would abstain from interference with the civil government. Cromwell's toleration was not the mere relieving of certain classes of the community from legal disabilities - but the distinct assertion that all good citizens have a right to decide their own religious affairs for themselves. Moreover, Cromwell endeavoured to make his toleration a reality by his Committee of Triers,²⁹ no presentee being entitled to enter a benefice until /

until he had received a certificate of the Committee - as also by his Committees of Scandalous Ministers.³⁰ These latter, like the former, were practically irresponsible in their action. It may be admitted, of course, that not a little was done to reform the prevalent irregularities and to introduce some semblance of order into the religious anarchy. The Committees, all the same, were far from "healing and settling", their work effectively forcing the Episcopalian clergy to many subterfuges and shifts in order to keep in touch with their congregations.

Such, then, was the religious situation when Baxter made his accommodation effort. In one striking passage of the *Reliquiae Baxterianae* he makes an interesting assessment of Erastians, Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Independents. As regards the Erastians, for example, he freely admits a certain power of magistrates,³¹ while, as regards the Episcopalians, their fixed bishops were so early an establishment of the church and so unopposed, they could not have been contrary to the apostolic mind.³² As regards the Presbyterians, he says -

"Both Scripture, Antiquity and the perswative Nature of Church Government, clearly shew that all Presbyters were Church Governours, as well as Church Teachers and that to deny this was to destroy the office, and to endeavour to destroy the Churches. And I saw in Scripture, Antiquity and Reason, that the Association of Pastors and Churches for Agreement, and their Synods in Cases of Necessity, are a plain duty: and that their ordinary stated Synods are usually very convenient."³³

As regards the Independents, he admits that, undoubtedly, there were "societies of Christians united for Personal Communion."³⁴ But Baxter has strictures to pass on them all. The Erastians, for example, /

example, made light of the power of the ministry, the church and excommunication.³⁵ The Episcopalians, too, -

"extinguished the ancient Species of Bishops, which was in the times of Ignatius, when every Church had one altar and one Bishop; and there were none but Itinerants or Arch-bishops that had many churches."³⁶

Again, as regards the Presbyterians, he objected to "their order of Lay-Elders who had no Ordination, nor Power to Preach, nor to administer Sacraments."³⁷ They "drew too near the way of Prelacie, by grasping at a kind of secular Power; not using it themselves, but binding the Magistrates to confiscate or imprison Men, merely because they were excommunicate."³⁸ As touching the Independents - they made too light of ordination. They were stricter about the qualifications of church members than Scripture and Reason and the practice of the Universal Church allowed. They had a tendency, too, to divisions.³⁹

And finally, Baxter's summing-up -

"For though Presbytery generally took in Scotland, yet it was but a stranger here: And it found some Ministers that lived in conformity to the Bishops, Liturgies and Ceremonies And though most of the Ministers (then) in England saw nothing in the Presbyterian way of practice, which they could not cheerfully concur in, yet it was but few that had resolved on their Principles: And when I came to try it I found that most were against the Jus Divinum of Lay Elders, and for the Moderate Primitive Episcopacy, and for a narrow, Congregational or Parochial Extent of ordinary Churches, and for an accommodation of all Parties, in order to Concord, as well as myself. I am sure as soon as I proposed it to them, I found most inclined to their way, and therefore I suppose it was their judgment before: yea, multitudes whom I had no converse with, I understood to be of their mind; so that this moderate Number, (I am loth to call them a Party), because they were for Catholicism against Parties), being no way pre-engaged, made the Work of Concord much more hopeful than else it would have been, or than I thought it to be when I first attempted it."⁴⁰

Baxter, accordingly, thinking there was sufficient ground to form a common platform, made his accommodation effort in his famous Voluntary Associations - the most interesting experiment of the Commonwealth period. In the spring of 1652, it was, at a Ministers' Meeting in his own home, that he brought forward a proposal for union - a voluntary scheme for discipline amongst the ministers of various faiths. Later, at a larger Ministers' Meeting held at Worcester he laid his entire "Design" before those present. The plan included "so much of the Church Order and Discipline as the Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Independent are agreed in as belonging to the Pastors of each particular church"⁴¹ - his ideal being to combine as far as possible the Episcopal presidency, the Presbyterian associateship and the Independent self-rule in a federated rather than an organic oneness. After several meetings of these and other ministers, all of Worcestershire, an agreement or Concord was entered into, eleven significant statements being made.⁴² The first and second define Church members as those who of their own consent make a creditable profession of faith and repentance, and give themselves up to God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. There is no reference to Confirmation or to any necessity of Episcopal government. The third states that it is lawful for one Church to consist of no more than could meet in one place. The fourth was to the effect that it was lawful for neighbouring pastors to help at the ordination of Presbyters, but that "they are truly Presbyters if they be ordained by the Presbyters of a particular church (and in cases of necessity if unordained) And if /

if any congregation through Error have no true Officers (in the judgment of the Synod) for want of true Ordination, yet let us hold such Communion with that Congregation (if other things correspond) as is due to a Neighbour Community of Christians, though not such as is due to a Political Society." ⁴³

Items five, six, seven, eight and ten deal with pastoral oversight and guarantee autonomy of the local, particular church in matters of worship and government purely within that church. Item nine is of the greatest importance. It reads - "We are agreed that all parishes that have in them a people professing Christianity, and content to live as particular Churches in communion for God's worship, are true Churches, as that word doth signify a Community of Christians."

This account is most interesting - but even more interesting is the fact that practically the entire membership was drawn from clergymen of the Church of England - a clear indication of the attitude ¹⁶⁵⁷ of the masses of ¹⁷⁵ the Episcopal ¹⁴⁴ clergy. Orme, the biographer of Baxter, has a neat way of describing the Voluntary Association -

"The object of it was to promote ministerial intercourse and improvement; to assist each other in promoting the interests of religion and morality, and in maintaining discipline and order in their respective congregations. It was not strictly Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent. It was not Episcopal; for it acknowledged no superiority among the ministers. It was not Presbyterian, for it disclaimed the exercise of authority on the part of the associated ministers, and acknowledged the right of the people 'to try and discern' the proceedings of the ministers. It was not Independent, because it recognised the right of ministers to act separately from the people, acknowledged the common parochial boundaries, and the magistrates' aid in certain cases. Yet does the whole constitution of this associated body, /

body, and its rules for the regulation of particular churches, correspond more with the voluntary character of Congregational churches than with any other system. This remark will apply generally to Baxter's sentiments on the subject of church-government and communion. He objected to being considered an Independent, as he objected to all party distinctions; but his writings and conduct were more in support of modified Independency than of any other system." (Works of Richard Baxter. Volume I. p. 578.)

The eleven rules of the Worcestershire Association were of such a nature that all who would subscribe thereto were accordingly bound together for a greater oversight of each other in matters of doctrine and discipline, for cultural aids to be gained through monthly lectures, and (in point eleven), for special help to young men just beginning their public ministry. Worcestershire was to be divided into five different Associations which were to meet in different places. The scheme seemed ideal, but Baxter states that not one Presbyterian, not one Independent, nor any of the New Prelatical way joined the Association. Practically the entire membership consisted of those who were "meer Catholicks - men of no Faction nor siding with any Party." The Worcestershire Association idea of Baxter spread, however, to other counties of England such as Dorset, Wilts, Somerset, Hampshire, Essex, Cambridge, Cheshire, Cornwall, Devon, Norfolk, Nottingham, Shropshire and perhaps Herefordshire.⁴⁵ By the beginning of 1657, indeed, it had been adopted in fourteen counties. "In due time," says Gardiner, "the example set was followed by the clergy in other counties. Baxter, indeed, counted Oliver as a traitor and a rebel; but there was no man in England whose action commended itself more highly to the heart of the Protector."⁴⁶

Naturally, /

Naturally, Baxter was pleased with his success - even North Wales and Ireland contributing to it. To gain, too, the Independents he expounded his system to the Rev. Philip Nye,⁴⁷ and was even sufficiently ambitious to make an endeavour to win over Anabaptists.⁴⁸ More interesting, perhaps, is the correspondence - suggested by the Rev. Richard Vine - with Bishop Brownrig, through whose instrumentality Baxter had hopes of winning over some of the High Episcopalians. His scheme was practically Ussher's -

"1. In every Parish, where there are more Presbyters than one, let one be the Chief, and his Consent chiefly taken in the Guidance of the Church.

2. Let many such Churches be associated (call it a Classis or what you will): and let the fittest man be your President as long as he is fit, that is, during Life, unless he deserve a removal.

3. Let divers of these Classes meet once or twice a year in a Provincial Assembly, and let the fittest man in the Province be their standing President: hitherto there is no Concession on the Presbyterian side, but that the President pro tempore, be turned to a standing President; nor any on the Episcopal side, but that (most necessary one) that every Presbyter be acknowledged a Church Guide, and not a meer Preacher.

4. Let it be left to each Man's Conscience, whether the President be called by the Name of Bishop, President, Superintendent, Moderator, seeing a Name is no meet Reason of a Breach.

5. Let no Man be forced to express his judgment de Jure, whether the President have a Negative Voice in Ordination or Excommunication, nor whether he be distinct in order, or only in degree, seeing it is not the unanimous and right belief concerning these things that is of Necessity (for then they must have been in our Creed) but the unanimous and right practice: But let all agree that they will joyn in these Classical and Provincial Assemblies, and then only ordain, and that they will not Ordain but when the President is one, unless in case of flat necessity which is never like to befall us if this way be taken."⁴⁹

To this Brownrig was, in the main, favourable, though he declined

any /

any departure from the negative vote and still maintained the superiority of bishops to presbyters as similar to that of the apostles to the seventy.^{50.}

Baxter's subsequent interview with Ussher - as narrated by himself - is most apposite to our subject.

"In this time I opened to Bishop Usher the motions of Concord which I had made with the Episcopal Divines, and desired his Judgment of my Terms which were these:

1. That every Pastor be the Governour, as well as the Teacher of his Flock.
2. In those Parishes that have more Presbyters than one, that one be the stated President.
3. That in every Market Town, or some such meet Divisions, there be frequent Assemblies of Parochial Pastors associated for Concord and mutual Assistance in their Work; and that in these Meetings, one be a stated, (not a temporary President).
4. That in every County or Diocess there be every every year, or half year, or quarter, an Assembly of all the Ministers of the County or Diocess; and that they also have their fixed President; and that in Ordination nothing be done without the President, nor in matters of common or publick concernment.
5. That the coercive Power or Sword be medled with by none but Magistrates."^{51.}

To these proposals Ussher agreed but was emphatic that they had no more chance of acceptance than his own.^{52.} And, indeed, if the approach to Bishop Brownrig came to nothing, we need not be surprized that the correspondence with Bishop Hammond met with no better fate.^{53.}

The Voluntary Associations - a most gallant attempt - were crushed out by the sheer pressure of events. The death of Cromwell, by opening the flood-gates of extreme policies, involved grievous blows to them.

XXI. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Richard Baxter. Catholic Unity. p. 14.
cf. "For I apprehend it is a matter of great necessity to imprint true catholicism on the minds of Christians; it being a most lamentable thing to observe how few Christians in the world there be, that fall not into one sect or other, and wrong not the common interest of Christianity for the promoting of the interest of their sect."
Orme. Baxter's Works. Vol. I. pp. 595 & 596.
2. Richard Baxter. Catholic Unity. p. 19.
3. Do. p. 21.
4. Do. p. 31.
5. Do. p. 31.
6. Do. p. 94.
7. Saint's Everlasting Rest. Preface.
The previous quotation regarding Personal Holiness is from "Richard Baxter" in Constructive Quarterly. VII., 26th June, 1919. pp. 100-105. F.J. Powicke.
cf. Prefatory Letter to "An Apology for the Nonconformist Ministry".
"I beg of you as on my knees, for your own sakes, for England's, for the Church's, for Christ's, that you will agree with us on these terms. I ask nothing of you for my own self: I need nothing that you can give me. My time of service is near an end: but England will be England, and souls and the Church's peace will be precious, and the cause will be the same when all present Nonconformists are dead; and bishops must die as well as we."
8. Richard Baxter. Constructive Quarterly. VII. 26th June, 1919. p. 140 seq.
9. The Cure of Church Divisions. Part I. Direction LVII. and LVIII. p. 278 seq.
Orme says of this book -
"It is full of excellent advice and admonition; but is both too general and too minute. It offended both parties, as the author anticipated; for he speaks too much as a dissenter for churchmen, and too much as a churchman for dissenters. He had an extensive knowledge of the evils and errors of all parties, on which he dwelt too largely; while he failed in adapting his remedies to the disease of which he so bitterly complains."
Baxter's Works. Vol. I. p. 598.
10. The Cure of Church Divisions. Parts I. & II.
11. The True and Only Way of Concord of all the Christian Churches. Chapter XVII. p. 139.
Orme /

Orme says of this book -

"There are many very excellent things, in the form both of principle and advice, scattered over this treatise; but there is a vast deal of extraneous matter, which so clouds and oppresses the argument, that much of its strength is destroyed."

Baxter's Works. Vol. I. pp. 604 & 605.

12. The True and Only Way of Concord. Part III. p. 25.
13. Do. Ch. IV. p. 29.
14. Do. Ch. V. p. 41 seq.
15. Do. Ch. VI. p. 52 seq.
16. Do. Ch. VII. Part III. p. 60 seq.
17. Do. Ch. VIII. Part III. p. 68 seq.
18. Do. Ch. IX.
19. Do. Ch. XI. p. 107 seq.
20. Do. Ch. XIII.
21. Do. Ch. XIV.
22. Do. Ch. XV. p. 134 seq.
23. Do. Ch. X. p. 137 seq.
24. Do. Part I. pp. 28 & 29.
25. Do. Part III. p. 20 seq.
26. "The result was that the clergy were by no means of one way of thinking. Independents, and occasionally Baptists as well as Presbyterians, became rectors or vicars, and impressed their individual views upon the congregations committed to their charge."
History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. 1649-1656.
S.R. Gardiner. Vol. II. p. 84.
27. Documents illustrative of the History of the English Church.
Gee and Hardy. p. 576.
Also Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution.
1628-1660. S.R. Gardiner. p. 324.
28. Documents illustrative of the History of the English Church.
Gee and Hardy. pp. 583 & 584.
Also Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution.
1628-1660. S.R. Gardiner. p. 340.
29. Documents illustrative of the History of the English Church.
Gee and Hardy. p. 577 seq.
cf. Baxter's views. While admitting their faults, he continues -
"Yet to give them their due, they did abundance of good to the Church: They saved many a Congregation from ignorant, ungodly, drunken Teachers: that sort of Men that intended no more in the Ministry, than to say a Sermon, as Readers say their Common Prayers, and so patch up a few good words together to talk the People asleep with on Sunday; and all the rest of the Week go with them to the Ale-house, and harden them in their Sin: And that sort of Ministers that either preacht against a holy Life, or preacht as Men that never were acquainted with it; all those that used the Ministry but /

but as a Common Trade to live by, and were never likely to convert a Soul; all these they usually rejected; and in their stead admitted of any that were able serious Preachers, and lived a godly Life, of what tollerable Opinion soever they were."

Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part I. p. 72.

Neal, also, is appreciative. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. pp. 92-103.

cf. Carlyle. Oliver Cromwell. Letters and Speeches.

A supreme Commission of "thirty-eight chosen Men, the acknowledged Flower of English Puritanism."

"The acknowledged Flower of Spiritual England at that time; and intent, as Oliver himself was, with an awful earnestness, on actually having the Gospel taught to England."

Vol. II. p. 297.

cf. Marsden.

"The triers were despotic; their determination was final and absolute; yet they were amenable to no law, and they were bound by no precedents. Their own judgment was their sole guide."

History of the Later Puritans. p. 379.

30. "A Body of Commissioners . . . to sit there, judging and sifting, till gradually all is sifted clean, and can be kept clean. This is the second branch of Oliver's form of Church-Government: this, with the other Ordinance, makes at last a kind of practicable Ecclesiastical Arrangement for England."

Carlyle. Oliver Cromwell. Letters and Speeches.

Vol. II. p. 298.

cf. Prof. Mackinnon's summing-up of Cromwell's toleration. "It was not toleration in itself that he had grasped, but toleration for all and sundry who would fight in the Puritan cause - the toleration of expediency. For those who fought in the Royalist cause, expediency, from the Cromwellian point of view, leaned all the other way - towards repression and exile, if not towards the scaffold. Still, his words have a noble ring in them and show a glimmering of the future trend of things."

A History of Modern Liberty. Vol. III. p. 471.

31. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 139.

32. Do. p. 140.

33. Do.

34. Do.

35. Do. p. 141.

36. Do. p. 142.

37. Do.

38. Do.

39. Do. p. 143.

40. Do. p. 146.

41. /

41. Christian Concord, or the Agreement of the Associated Pastors and Churches of Worcestershire: with Richard Baxter's Explication and Defence of it and his Exhortation to Unity. 1653.
42. The Rules of the Association are given as an appendix to the present Sources and Authorities - which see.
43. Christian Concord. p. 55 seq.
44. cf. Baxter's account.
 There were two kinds of Episcopal men.
 "The one was the old common moderate sort, who were commonly in Doctrine Calvinists, and took Episcopacy to be necessary ad bene esse Ministerii et ecclesiae, but not ad esse; and took all those of the Reformed that had not Bishops, for true Churches and Ministers, wanting only that which they thought would make them more compleat. The other sort followed Dr. H. Hammond, and were very new, and very few. Their Judgment was that all the Texts of Scripture which speak of Presbyters, do mean Bishops, and that the office of Subject-Presbyters was not in the Church in Scripture Times, but that the Apostles planted in every Church only a Bishop with Deacons, but with this intent (asserted but never proved) that in time, when the Christians multiplied, these Bishops should ordain Subject-Presbyters under them, and be the Pastors of many Churches: And they held that Ordination without Bishops was invalid, and a Ministry so ordained was null, and the Reformed Churches that had no Bishops, nor Presbyters ordained by Bishops, were no true Churches, though the Church of Rome be a true church, as having Bishops."
 Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 149.
45. Do. p. 148.
 Details given in Shaw. Church under the Commonwealth. Vol. II.
46. History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. Vol. III. p. 27.
 According to Gardiner, Baxter's attempt was chiefly interesting "as showing that the tide was turning against sectarian organisation as well as against sectarian theology." Vol. IV. p. 24.
47. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. pp. 188-193.
48. Do. pp. 180-188.
49. Do. p. 173.
50. Do. p. 177.
51. Do. p. 206.
52. Do.
- Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 75.
53. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 210.

A P P E N D I X.

Rules of the Worcestershire Association.

- "(1), We Judge it convenient to meet in five several Associations at five several places in this county, viz. at Worcester, Evesham, Upton, Kidderminster and Bromsgrove, and this once a month on a day to be agreed on (or oftener if need require).
- (2) We shall not, by dividing the county, presume to limit others to any one of these Associations, but let every Minister, according to his own convenience, choose to which of these Associations he will join himself; and accordingly subscribe to a copy of these Articles, which shall be kept at the place of meeting for that Association; and so may any Minister that shall hereafter joyn with us, who at the present doth not.
- (3) We shall give notice to all Ministers of piety and competent ability, who now are not among us, and desire them to joyn with us, and offer them a free debate of any thing which they may scruple, and desire them to adjoin themselves to which association they judge most convenient.
- (4) We shall at these monthly meetings keep up a publique Lecture for the Common benefit.
- (5) At these meetings we shall maintain some disputation or other exercise, which shall be found most useful to our own edification, especially for the younger sort of Ministers, or else meet on purpose for this, another day.
- (6) We shall here endeavour, on consultation, to resolve all particular doubts that arise about Discipline or Worship or Doctrine, which (for the avoiding of all occasions of division) we have not thought fit to make the matter of this agreement, or which these general Rules suffice not to determine.
- (7) We shall here also produce and propose to consideration, any new point of Doctrine wherein we differ from the most of the Reformed Churches, before we adventure to teach it to our hearers.
- (8) We shall here debate all differences in Judgment (fit for debate) that may happen among ourselves, or any of our People.

- (9) We shall here receive any complaint that any people have against any member of our Association, for scandal, false doctrine or Maladministration; and we all resolve to give an account of our Doctrine and actions, when any offended brother shall so accuse us, both for the satisfaction of the church and him.
- (10) We shall here make known the Names of all those whom we have put out of our Communion; and we resolve all of us to refuse communion with such, and not to receive them into one church who are cast out of another, except they have given satisfaction, or we first here prove them unjustly cast out.
- (11) We desire that all young Ministers, or any that are not well furnished with discretion, or ability to manage those publick reproofs and censures, would do nothing in it without first consulting these Assemblies. Yea, in so weighty a case as excluding from Church Communion, we Judge it convenient that all Ministers advise with their Brethren of that Association for their safer proceeding."
-

XXII.

THE RESTORATION.

THE WORCESTER HOUSE DECLARATION and ACCOMMODATION.

"At the Restoration of Charles there was a golden opportunity for strengthening the National Church on its true basis, as expounded by Stillingfleet, with the liberty of prophesying which had been advocated by Jeremy Taylor." ¹ So writes an excellent historian of our period. This chapter, accordingly, we shall devote to examining the opening accommodation of the Restoration and the truth of his statement. Certainly, from now onwards to the Revolution, accommodation and comprehension were words of daily counsel and, indeed, of daily conversation, it being the great age of accommodationists.

Our business it is not, of course, to describe the Restoration - a historic event we assume and proceed with our present study.

The Presbyterians, be it said, had high hopes. When, indeed, the Long Parliament met on February 21, 1660 they were actually in the ascendency. General Monk, addressing those present, professed his zeal for the Commonwealth, and gave it as his opinion that the want of church government had been the cause of the nation's distraction. If monarchy were introduced, he said, "Prelacy must be brought in, which these nations cannot bear and against which they have so solemnly sworn." All these earlier speeches of Monk bear a strong flavour of his Scottish experiences, and were characteristic /

characteristic of his cunning apprehension. His conclusion was in accordance with the temper of the House, that "Moderate, not rigid, Presbyterian government, with a sufficient liberty for consciences truly tender, appears at present to be the most indifferent and acceptable way to the Church's settlement." And so the renovated Parliament declared afresh that Presbyterianism was the established faith and order of the Church of England - with, however, be it noted - a fact creditable to the Presbyterians - an express toleration for tender consciences - a copy of the Solemn League and Covenant being hung up on the walls of the House and in the parish churches, to be read publicly once a year. A new Council of State, too, was appointed and writs issued for the calling of a new and free Parliament at once, of both Lords and Commons.

The Long Parliament was finally dissolved on March 16, 1660 - a great and memorable Parliament. Monk, however, with masterly duplicity, so soon as Parliament met, had a messenger ready from Charles with communications but especially with the famous Declaration of Breda.

"And because the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced several opinions in religion, by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other (which, when they shall hereafter unite in a freedom of conversation, will be composed or better understood), we do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an Act of Parliament as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered to us, for the full granting that indulgence." ²

So ran one fateful paragraph. The promise was impressive. Could Charles, however, be trusted? Some Presbyterians and others, such as Matthew Hale, sought guarantees but were overruled. Charles, proclaimed King on May 8, 1660 entered London on May 29 to the vociferous acclamations of the multitude. Despite the legal position, however, it was plain that Presbyterian government and worship, pure and simple, could not be maintained. Presbyterianism in England, it must be confessed, had not been a native plant. The reaction was too strong. Obviously, if Presbyterianism was to have any say at all it could only be along the lines of accommodation - and well did the Presbyterians know it.³ A rigid section, doubtless, - men like Dr. Lazarus Seaman and William Jenkyn - would have stood by the old claims but the majority knew the futility of such a position. Actually, in their visit to Breda, their deputation - Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Spurstow, Calamy, Hall, Manton and Case - had made strong affirmation of their loyalty and their willingness to consider a moderate Episcopacy.⁴ The King, we are told, spoke kindly to them and promised to refer all to Parliament. Later, when ten of their number, Drs. Reynolds, Spurstow, Wallis, Manton, Bates and Messrs. Calamy, Ashe, Case, Baxter and Woodbridge were made chaplains, hopes were renewed.⁵ When, too, the new bishops were appointed, five sees were kept vacant for leading Presbyterian divines - if only they would conform, which, however, almost unanimously, they did not.⁶

And now, we come to the actual accommodation of 1660. The Presbyterians were ready to offer, as a basis, Ussher's model of Primitive /

Primitive Episcopacy - the surplice, the cross in baptism, kneeling at communion being things indifferent - while there was a readiness to depart from the Westminster Confession and a willingness to accept the Articles of the Church of England with certain amendments. About the middle of June Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Wallis, Dr. Manton, Dr. Spurstow, Calamy, Ashe and Baxter waited upon the King, being introduced by the Earl of Manchester, to ask his Majesty's interposition to reconcile the differences in the church; that the people might not be deprived of their faithful pastors. Baxter told his Majesty, that the interest of the late usurpers with the people arose from the encouragement they had given religion; and he hoped the King would not undo, but rather go beyond, the good which Cromwell or any other had done. Once more the King expressed his willingness but stressed the importance of concessions being made by each side. He further requested them to draw up their proposals for church government, setting down the most they could yield and promising them a meeting with the Episcopal party. Accordingly, a meeting - with representatives from the country - did take place at Sion College. As a result, a paper, mostly the work of Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Worth and Calamy - together with Ussher's Reduction - was submitted to the King. As this is an important document in our present enquiry, it is important to give the gist of it -

"In humble conformity to your majesty's Christian designs, we, taking it for granted that there is a firm agreement between our brethren and us in the doctrinal proofs of the reformed religion, and in the substantial parts of divine worship, humbly desire,

First, /

First, That we may be secured of those things in practice of which we seem to be agreed in principle; as,

(1) That those of our flocks that are serious in matters of their salvation may not be reproachfully handled by words of scorn, or any abusive language, but may be encouraged in their duties of exhorting and provoking one another in their most holy faith, and of farthering one another in the ways of eternal life.

(2) That each congregation may have a learned, orthodox, and godly pastor, that the people may be publicly instructed by preaching every Lord's day, by catechising, by frequent administering the Lord's supper and baptism; and that effectual provision by law may be made, that such as are insufficient, negligent, or scandalous, may not officiate.

(3) That none may be admitted to the Lord's supper till they personally own their baptismal covenant by a credible profession of faith and holiness, not contradicted by a scandalous life. That to such only confirmation may be administered; and that the approbation of the pastor to whom the instructing those under his charge doth appertain, may be produced before any person receives confirmation.

(4) That an effectual course be taken for the sanctification of the Lord's day, appropriating the same to holy exercises both in public and private, without any unnecessary divertisements.

Then for matters in difference, viz. church-government, liturgy, and ceremonies, we humbly represent,

That we do not renounce the true ancient primitive episcopacy or presidency, as it was balanced with a due commixtion of presbyters. If therefore your majesty, in your grave wisdom and moderation, shall constitute such an episcopacy, we shall humbly submit thereunto. And in order to an accommodation in this weighty affair, we desire humbly to offer some particulars which we conceive were amiss in the episcopal government as it was practised before the year 1640.

1. The great extent of the bishop's diocess, which we apprehend too large for his personal inspection.

2. That by reason of this disability the bishops did depute the administration, in matters of spiritual cognizance, to commissaries, chancellors, officials, whereof some are secular persons, and could not administer that power that originally belongs to the officers of the church.

3. That the bishops did assume the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction to themselves.

4. That some of the bishops exercised an arbitrary power, by sending forth articles of visitation, inquiring unwarrantably into several things; and swearing churchwardens to present accordingly. Also many innovations and ceremonies were imposed upon ministers and people not required by law.

For remedy of these evils we crave leave to offer,

1. The late most reverend primate of Ireland, his reduction of episcopacy into the form of synodical government.

2. We humbly desire that the suffragans, or chorepiscopi, may be chosen by the respective synods.

3. That no oaths, or promises of obedience to the bishops, nor any unnecessary subscriptions or engagements, be made necessary to ordination, institution, or induction, ministration, communion, or immunities, of ministers, they being responsible for any transgression of the law. And that no bishops or ecclesiastical governors may exercise their government by their private will or pleasure, but only by such rules, canons, and constitutions, as shall be established by parliament.

Secondly, Concerning liturgy,

1. We are satisfied in our judgments concerning the lawfulness of a liturgy, or form of worship, provided it be for matter agreeable to the word of God, and suited to the nature of the several ordinances and necessities of the church, neither too tedious, nor composed of too short prayers or responsals, not dissonant from the liturgies of other reformed churches, nor too rigorously imposed, nor the minister confined thereunto, but that he may also make use of his gifts for prayer and exhortation.

2. Forasmuch as the Book of Common Prayer is in some things justly offensive, and needs amendment, we most humbly pray, that some learned, godly, and moderate divines of both persuasions, may be employed to compile such a form as is before described, as much as may be in Scripture words; or at least to revise and reform the old; together with an addition of other various forms in Scripture phrase, to be used at the minister's choice.

Thirdly, Concerning ceremonies,

We hold ourselves obliged, in every part of divine worship, to do all things decently and in order, and to edification;

edification; and are willing to be determined by authority in such things as being merely circumstantial, or common to human actions and societies, are to be ordered by the light of nature, and human prudence.

As to divers ceremonies formerly retained in the church of England, we do, in all humanity, offer to your majesty the following considerations:

That the worship of God is in itself pure and perfect, and decent, without any such ceremonies. That it is then most pure and acceptable when it has least of human mixtures. That these ceremonies have been imposed and advanced by some, so as to draw near to the significancy and moral efficacy of sacraments. That they have been rejected by many of the reformed churches abroad, and have been ever the subject of contention and endless disputes in this church; and therefore being in their own nature indifferent, and mutable, they ought to be changed, lest in time they should be apprehended as necessary as the substantials of worship themselves.

May it therefore please your majesty graciously to grant, that kneeling at the Lord's supper, and such holy-days as are but of human institution, may not be imposed on such as scruple them. That the use of the surplice and cross in baptism, and bowing at the name of Jesus, may be abolished. And forasmuch as erecting altars and bowing towards them, and such like (having no foundation in the law of the land), have been introduced and imposed, we humbly beseech your majesty, that such innovations may not be used or imposed for the future."

Apparently, Charles gave these proposals a favourable reception and expressed his pleasure at the accommodating spirit they displayed. The bishops, however - instructed by Clarendon - as being legally in situ, were not ready to negotiate but only to comment on the proposals. Unnecessary it is to detail the whole of the bishops' answer. Indeed, the references to the Liturgy and ceremonies may well be omitted. It can be noted, however, that a willingness to revise the Liturgy was expressed, also a disposition to grant liberty to tender consciences with respect to ceremonies - as his Majesty might judge.

As /

As being relative, however, to our subject, the following portion it is well to quote -

"Concerning church-government - That they never heard any just reasons for a dissent from the ecclesiastical hierarchy of this kingdom, which they believe in the main to be the true primitive episcopacy, which was more than a mere presidency of order. Nor do they find that it was balanced by an authoritative commixtion of presbyters, though it has been in all times exercised with the assistance and counsel of presbyters in subordination to bishops. They wonder that they should except against the government by one single person, which, if applied to the civil magistrate, is a most dangerous insinuation.

As to the four particular instances of things amiss.

1. We cannot grant the extent of any diocess is so great, but that a bishop may well perform his duty, which is not a personal inspection of every man's soul, but the pastoral charge, or taking care that the ministers, and other ecclesiastical officers within their diocess, do their duties; and if some diocesses should be too large, the law allows suffragans.

2. Concerning lay-chancellors, &c. we confess the bishops did depute part of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction to chancellors, commissaries, officials, &c. as men better skilled in the civil and canon laws; but as for matters of mere spiritual concernment, as excommunication, absolution, and other censures of the church, we conceive they belong properly to the bishop himself, or his surrogate, wherein, if any thing has been done amiss, we are willing it should be reformed.

3. Whether bishops are a distinct order from presbyters, or not; or, whether they have the sole power of ordination, is not now the question; but we affirm, that the bishops of this realm have constantly ordained with the assistance of presbyters, and the imposition of their hands together with the bishops, and for this purpose the colleges of deans and chapters are instituted.

4. As to archbishop Usher's model of church-government, we decline it, as not consistent with his other learned discourses on the original of episcopacy, and of metropolitans; nor with the king's supremacy in causes ecclesiastical."

Of course, the Presbyterians replied to this - in a week's time. The only passages it is imperative to quote are these -

"Concerning /

"Concerning Church Government.

Had you read Gerson, Bucer, Parker, Baynes, Salmasius, Blondel, &c. you would have seen just reasons given for our dissent from the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as stated in England.

Instances of things amiss.

You would easily grant that diocesses are too great, if you had ever conscionably tried the task which Dr. Hammond describeth as the bishop's work; or had ever believed Ignatius, and other ancient descriptions of a bishop's church. You cannot be ignorant, that our bishops have the sole government of pastors and people; that the whole power of the keys is in their hands, and that their presbyters are but ciphers.

Concerning Ceremonies.

These divines argue for leaving them indifferent for the peace of the church, as being not essential to the perfection of Christian worship, especially when so many looked upon them as sinful.

We perceive your counsels against peace are not likely to be frustrated. Your desires concerning us are likely to be accomplished. You are like to be gratified with our silence and ejection; and yet we will believe, that 'Blessed are the peace-makers;' and though we are prevented by you in our pursuits of peace, and are never like thus publicly to seek it more, yet are we resolved, as much as possible, to live peaceably with all men."

This last paragraph shows a certain note of bitterness.

Feelings, indeed, were being raised and tempers somewhat ruffled. The leading Presbyterians, however, applied yet again to the King and once more were kindly received.⁹ On October 22, a Conference of the two parties took place at Worcester House, among those on the one side being Bishops Sheldon, Morley, Henchman, Cosin, Gauden, Hacket and Dr. Barwick, and on the other, Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Spurstow, Dr. Manton, Dr. Wallis, Calamy, Ashe - and Baxter.

These are interesting names. Baxter we already know sufficiently /

sufficiently well. Of Ashe The Nonconformist's Memorial says he was "a Christian of the primitive simplicity; and a Nonconformist of the old stamp. He was eminent for a holy life, a cheerful mind, and a fluent elegance of prayer." ¹⁰ Of Spurstow the same source declares, after describing his part in the Treaty of Newport, "he was a man of great humility and meekness; of eminent charity, both in giving and forgiving; and of a very peaceable disposition." ¹¹ Reynolds is delineated by Anthony Wood as "a person of excellent parts and endowments, of a very good wit, fancy and judgment, a great divine, and much esteemed by all parties for his preaching and florid stile of singular affability, meekness and humility, of great learning." ¹² Of Manton Wood does not give a very favourable picture. He admits, however, his great learning. ¹³ Noblemen present included Albemarle, Ormond, Manchester, Anglesey and Hollis - of these, the last three being in favour of moderate Episcopacy.

As a result, and after debate and criticism, there was issued an amended Royal Declaration - The Worcester House Declaration.

Here again, we need only reproduce the most important and relevant paragraphs.

"1. We declare our purpose and resolution is, and shall be, to promote the power of godliness, to encourage the public and private exercises of religion, to take care of the due observation of the Lord's day; and that insufficient, negligent, and scandalous ministers be not permitted in the church. We shall take care to prefer none to the episcopal office and charge but men of learning, virtue, and piety; and we shall provide the best we can, that the bishops be frequent preachers, and that they do often preach in some church or other of their diocess.

2. Because some diocesses may be of too large extent, we will appoint such a number of suffragans as shall be sufficient for the due performance of their work.

3. No bishops shall ordain or exercise any part of jurisdiction which appertains to the censures of the church, without advice and assistance of the presbyters. No chancellors, commissaries, or officials, shall excommunicate, absolve, or exercise, any act of spiritual jurisdiction, wherein any of the ministry are concerned with reference to their pastoral charge. Nor shall the archdeacon exercise any jurisdiction without the advice and assistance of six ministers of his archdeaconry; three to be nominated by the bishop, and three by the suffrage of the presbyters within the archdeaconry.

4. We will take care, that the preferment of deans and chapters shall be given to the most learned and pious presbyters of the diocess, and that an equal number (to those of the chapter) of the most learned and pious presbyters of the same diocess, annually chosen by the major vote of all the presbyters of that diocess present at such elections, shall be always advising and assisting, together with those of the chapter, in all ordinations, at all church-censures, and other important acts of ecclesiastical jurisdiction wherein any of the ministry are concerned. Provided that at all such meetings, the number of ministers so elected, and those of the chapter present, be equal; and to make the numbers equal, the juniors of the exceeding number shall withdraw to make way for the more ancient. Nor shall any suffragan bishop ordain or exercise any jurisdiction, without the advice and assistance of a sufficient number of presbyters annually chosen as before. And our will is, that ordination be constantly and solemnly performed by the bishop and his aforesaid presbytery at the four set times appointed by the church for that purpose.

5. Confirmation shall be rightly and solemnly performed, by the information and with the consent of the minister of the place, who shall admit none to the Lord's supper, till they have made a credible profession of their faith, and promised obedience to the will of God, according to the rubric before the catechism; and all diligence shall be used for the instruction and reformation of scandalous offenders, whom the minister shall not suffer to partake of the Lord's supper till they have openly declared their repentance, and resolutions of amendment; provided there be place for appeals to superior powers. Every rural dean (to be nominated by the bishop as heretofore) with three or four ministers of that deanery chosen by the major part of all the ministers within the same, shall meet once a month to /

to receive complaints from the ministers or churchwardens of parishes, and to compose such differences as shall be referred to them for arbitration, and to reform such things as are amiss, by their pastoral reproofs and admonitions, and what they cannot reform are to be presented to the bishop. Moreover, the rural dean and his assistants are to take care of the catechising children and youth, and that they can give a good account of their faith before they are brought to the bishop to be confirmed.

6. No bishop shall exercise any arbitrary power, or impose any thing upon his clergy or people, but according to the law of the land.

7. We will appoint an equal number of divines of both persuasions to review the liturgy of the church of England, and to make such alterations as shall be thought necessary; and some additional forms in the Scripture phrase, as near as may be, suited to the nature of the several parts of worship, and that it be left to the minister's choice to use one or the other at his discretion. In the mean time, we desire that the ministers in their several churches will not wholly lay aside the use of the common prayer, but will read those parts of it against which they have no exception; yet our will and pleasure is, that none be punished or troubled for not using it till it be reviewed and effectually reformed.

8. Lastly, concerning ceremonies, if any are practised contrary to law, the same shall cease. Every national church has a power to appoint ceremonies for its members, which, though before they were indifferent, yet ceased to be so when established by law. We are therefore content to indulge tender consciences, so far as to dispense with their using such ceremonies as are an offence to them, but not to abolish them. We declare therefore, that none shall be compelled to receive the sacrament kneeling, nor to use the cross in baptism, nor to bow at the name of Jesus, nor to use the surplice, except in the royal chapel, and in cathedral and collegiate churches. Nor shall subscription, nor the oath of canonical obedience, be required at present, in order to ordination, institution, or induction, but only the taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; nor shall any lose their academical degrees, or forfeit a presentation, or be deprived of a benefice, for not declaring his assent to all the thirty-nine articles, provided he read and declare his assent to all the doctrinal articles, and to the sacraments. And we do again renew our declaration from Breda, that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom." 14.

This /

This remarkable Declaration - and it takes an honourable place in the evolution of Accommodation - pleased the majority, though a minority was still critical. Indeed, a second address to the King was ventured upon, renewing the request for Ussher's scheme of primitive Episcopacy.

"They complain, that parish-discipline is not sufficiently granted in his majesty's declaration, that inferior synods are passed by, and that the bishop is not episcopus praeses, but episcopus princeps, endued with sole power of ordination and jurisdiction. They therefore pray again, that archbishop Usher's form of church-government may be established, at least in these three points.

1. That the pastors of parishes may be allowed to preach, catechise, and deny the communion of the church to the impenitent, scandalous, or such as do not make a credible profession of faith and obedience to the commands of Christ.

2. That the pastors of each rural deanery may meet once a month, to receive presentments and appeals, to admonish offenders, and after due patience to proceed to excommunication.

3. That a diocesan synod of the delegates of rural synods may be called as often as need requires; that the bishop may not ordain or exercise spiritual censures without the consent of the majority; and that neither chancellors, archdeacons, commissaries, nor officials, may pass censures purely spiritual; but for the exercise of civil government coercively by mulcts, or corporal penalties, by power derived from your majesty, as supreme over all persons and things ecclesiastical, we presume not at all to interpose." ¹⁵

Further complaints had reference to the Liturgy and ceremonies but continued in terms relative to another important matter -

"We therefore earnestly crave, that your majesty will declare your pleasure, 1. That ordination, and institution, and induction, may be conferred without the said subscription and oath. 2. That none may be urged to be reordained, or denied institution for want of ordination by prelates that have been ordained by presbyters. 3. That none may forfeit their presentation or benefice for not reading those articles of the thirty-nine that relate to government and ceremonies." ¹⁶

On the other hand, the London Presbyterians were so pleased with the Declaration that they presented to the King a special address of thanks.¹⁷ As a result, too, Dr. Reynolds¹⁸ accepted the bishopric of Norwich, and, while it is true that Baxter refused that of Hereford and Calamy that of Lichfield, Dr. Manton accepted the living of Covent-garden. Dr. Bates,¹⁹ in addition, declined the deanery of Lichfield, Dr. Manton that of Rochester, and Bowles that of York.

Nevertheless, this accommodation was doomed to failure - a cause of grief to the moderate party - as it had many good points - the concessions made to the presbyters being considerable, the offers made with respect to the Liturgy and ceremonies liberal, and, above all, the atmosphere conciliatory. "Had it been observed", says Marsden, "it would have been the Magna Charta of the puritans."²⁰ All, however, in vain - obviously the court was in opposition, and the Episcopal party, the natural man being what he is, and having the upper hand, was inclined to have its revenge for the sufferings of the Commonwealth period. The Declaration - we can appreciate now - had been but a feeler to see what kind of reception such a compromise was likely to get. True - a Bill was introduced into the Convention Parliament to give it the force of law - the majority, however, would have nothing to do with it, and it was, accordingly, thrown out by a majority of twenty-six.²¹ Clarendon, gauging the possibilities, felt he could proceed without granting the concessions²² - for Presbyterianism, it seemed, was on the decline even in London and Lancashire, many, too, of their leaders /

leaders were willing, apparently, to accept an unaltered Prayer Book, while Reynolds would go the length of accepting a bishopric.

The verdict is brief and pointed - the accommodation was wrecked by the Convention Parliament - but would not the ensuing Royal Parliament have wrecked it too? ²³

XXII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Dr. J. Hunt. Article "Rise of Dissent in England" in "The Church, Past and Present." Edited H.M. Gwatkin. p. 147.
2. Documents illustrative of the History of the English Church. Gee and Hardy. p. 587.
Clarendon. The History of the Rebellion. Vol. VII. p. 504 seq.
3. So Sharp. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 226.
4. Clarendon. The History of the Rebellion. Vol. VII. p. 543.
5. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 231.
6. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 238.
6. Do. p. 244.
7. Do. pp. 251-254.
- Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. pp. 233-236.
Cardwell. A History of Conferences. p. 277 seq.
8. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. pp. 255 & 256.
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. pp. 242 & 243.

As regards the criticism of Ussher the text in full is -
 "The Primates Reduction, though not published in his Life time, was formed many years before his Death, and shewed to some Persons (ready to attest the same) in the Year 1640 but it is not consistent with two other Discourses of the same Learned Primate (viz. the one of the Original of Episcopacy, and the other of the Original of Metropolitans) both printed in the Year 1641 and written with great diligence and much variety of ancient Learning. In neither of which is to be found any mention of the Reduction aforesaid. Neither is there in either of them propounded any such Model of Church Government, as in the said Reduction is contained. Which doubtless would have been done, had that Platform been according to his settled Judgment in those Matters.

In which Reduction there are sundry things (as namely the Conforming of Saffragans to the number of Rural Deaneries) which are apparently private Conceptions of his own; accommodated at that time for the taking off some present Animosities: but wholly destitute of any Colour of Testimony or President from Antiquity, nor is any such by him offered towards the proof thereof.

And it would be considered, whether the Final Resolution of all Ecclesiastical Power and Jurisdiction into a National Synod, where it seemeth to be placed in that Reduction without naming the King, or without any dependance upon him, or relation to him, be not destructive of the King's Supremacy in causes Ecclesiastical.

It is observable nevertheless, that even in the Reduction Archi-Episcopacy is acknowledged."

- Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 244.
9. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 259.
10. Nonconformist's Memorial. Vol. I. p. 94.
11. Do. Vol. II. p. 448.
12. Anthony Wood. Athenae Oxonienses. Vol. III. Column 1084.
13. Do. Column 1134 seq.
14. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. pp. 259-264.
Cardwell. A History of Conferences. p. 286 seq.
Wilkins' Concilia.
- "To maintain the splendour and the powers of Episcopacy, to yield nothing, and yet to avoid the appearance of a direct breach of the royal word, was so glaringly the object of the Court, that wilful blindness only could fail to penetrate the transparent veil of 'The Declaration' framed by Clarendon with all the astuteness of his profession, and accepted by the Presbyterians with the eagerness of expiring hope. Baxter was not so deceived."
- Sir James Stephen's Essay on Baxter. Richard Baxter's Self-Review and Stephen's Essay on Baxter. Ed. by Bishop of Chester. pp. 95 & 96.
15. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 265.
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 269.
16. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 266.
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. pp. 273 & 274.
17. Given in Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. pp. 267 & 268.
18. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. pp. 284 & 285.
cf. Works of Edward Reynolds. Vol. I. Life. Alexander Chalmers.
- "But it is not easy to discover by what process of reasoning he could arrive at the conclusion, that the acceptance of a bishoprick, even if the Declaration had passed into a law, would not be a violation of the Covenant." p. lxii.
19. Nonconformist's Memorial.
- "Though he refused to conform, he was not engaged in the interest of any party as such: for he had a catholic spirit, and wished the union of all parties of christians, upon moderate principles and practices. He was for having the church free as Christ hath left it; and yet for peace and union's sake he would have yielded to any thing but sin. He vigorously pursued the design of a comprehension, as long as there was any hope: but he at last saw there was none, till God should give a more suitable spirit to all concerned. His moderation however was great to the last; being exceedingly cherished by a firm apprehension that the things wherein only it was possible /

possible for good men to differ, must be trifles, in comparison with the much greater things, wherein it was impossible for them not to agree."

Vol. I. p. 117.

20. Marsden. History of the Later Puritans. p. 431.
 of. Prof. Mackinnon. History of Modern Liberty.
 "The Declaration . . . certainly deserved a better fate. It would have united the two largest ecclesiastical parties in the land in a moderate national church. It would have conjoined in church government what the one party regarded as the benefit of episcopal supervision with what the other regarded as the benefit of Presbyterian control."
 Vol. IV. p. 176.
21. Parl. Hist. iv. 152-154.
 Commons' Journals. Wed., 28th Nov.
 Says Baxter -
 "I knew not of any one Lord at Court that was a Presbyterian; yet were the Earl of Manchester (a good Man) and the Earl of Anglesey, and the Lord Hollis called Presbyterians, and as such appointed to direct and help them: when I have heard them plead for moderate Episcopacy and Liturgy my self; and they would have drawn us to yield further than we did."
 Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 278.
22. "The king desired no more than that they should do nothing, being sure that in a little time he should himself do the work best."
 So Clarendon.
 Calendar of State Papers. Dom. Charles II. Nov. 1, 1660.
 The Bill had "happily been thrown out."
 So Secretary Nicholas.
 State Papers. Dom. Charles II. December 7, 1660.
23. Baxter gives three results of the Declaration -
 a. The nation could see the Presbyterian wishes were not so unreasonable.
 b. The persecuting laws pending over all nonconformists were restrained for another year.
 c. The Presbyterian case had been given to their future persecutors.
 Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 286.

XXIII.

THE WILKINS and BURTON ACCOMMODATION.

The next outstanding date in our enquiry is 1668 - the year of the Wilkins and Burton Accommodation. Between then and 1660, of course, there had been many memorable events - the Savoy Conference of 1661, for example - which, while admittedly a conference between Episcopalians and Presbyterians, need not command our attention. For one thing, its subject was the revision of the Prayer Book, not comprehension - besides, compromise did not figure among its watchwords, the bishops contenting themselves with a purely defensive attitude. The result was a division - a division which remains to this day.

Again, there were the repressive Acts - the Act of Uniformity (1662), which not only enforced the use of the Prayer Book, but required all lay folk to attend the Church services under pain of imprisonment; the Corporation Act (1661), which excluded the dissenters from municipal office; the Conventicle Act (1664), which forbade all meetings for worship apart from the Church under harsh penalties; the Five Mile Act (1665), which obliged all dissenting ministers either to take an oath not to attempt to alter the constitution in Church or State, or not to come within five miles of a town. Together these formed a formidable engine with which to force civil and religious disability on the nonconformists. The ejection of the "two thousand" is among the saddest stories of English church history. The atmosphere - be it admitted /

admitted - did not seem particularly kindly for any projected comprehension. All the same, the accommodationists did not despair. Says Neal -

"But here the reader must distinguish between those zealots, who, from resentment, bigotry, or sinister views, set themselves to encourage and promote all the methods of oppression and tyranny; and those, who, though they complied with the terms of conformity themselves, were disposed to an accommodation with the Protestant Nonconformists upon moderate terms.

The bishops were generally of the former sort; they were old and exasperated, fond of their persecuting principles, and fearful of every thing that tended to relieve the Presbyterians. They went with zeal into all the slavish doctrines of the prerogative, and voted with the court in every thing they required."

Some of the more moderate men named by this historian of the Puritans are - Bishop Laney, Bishop Sanderson, Bishop Cosin - all of whom had shown a different spirit at one time. In addition, were Bishops Gauden, Wilkins and Reynolds,² men who had been invariably moderate.

A further distinction, drawn by Neal, is interesting -

"The like may be observed of the inferior clergy, who were divided, a few years after, into those of the court and the country; the former were of an angry superstitious spirit, and far more strenuous for a few indifferent ceremonies, than for the peace of the church, or its more important articles."

"The country-clergy were of a quite different spirit; they were determined Protestants and true churchmen, but more disposed to a coalition with Protestant dissenters than with Papists; among these were the Tillotsons, Stillingfleets, Whichcotes, Wilkins, Cudworths, &c. men of the first rank for learning, sobriety, and virtue."³

It seems, therefore, that there was material for a fresh attempt at accommodation. Some of the ejected Presbyterians, too, had acted in a way that certainly strengthened the possibility.

These /

These men -

"who were men of piety and learning, complied as far as they could, and made a distinction between lay-conformity and ministerial, they practised the former, and went sometimes to their parish-churches before or after the exercise of their ministry in some private houses; and this they did, not for interest or advantage, but to all appearance to express their catholicism and brotherly love. Here was the rise of occasional conformity, practised by Dr. Bates, Mr. Baxter, and others, to their death."

So writes Neal ⁴ - an interesting side-light, indeed.

At any rate, a number of accommodations now took shape. Clarendon had gone. It was possible, accordingly, for Sir Robert Atkins - destined to be Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer - to prepare a Bill of Comprehension, a measure which Colonel Birch, member for Penryn, undertook to introduce into the House of Commons. ⁵ The Bill provided that ordained ministers, Episcopal and Presbyterian, who should within the next three months subscribe to all the Articles of Religion which only concerned the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments should be capable of preaching in any church or chapel in England, of administering the sacraments according to the Book of Common Prayer, of taking upon them the cure of souls, and of enjoying any spiritual promotion. After stating that the Common Prayer, according to law, would be read before sermon, there followed a proviso, that no one should be denied the Lord's Supper, although he did not kneel in the act of receiving it; and that no minister should be compelled to wear the surplice, or use the cross in baptism. The authors of this accommodation, in addition to clauses touching Presbyterian ordination and ceremonies, wished to /

to have the word 'consent' left out of the form of subscription -
 to confine subscription to the doctrine of the Christian faith -
 not to bind ministers to read the Common Prayer themselves, if
 they procured others to do it - and to lay aside the Oath of
 Adjunction.^b Alas, this Bill was never printed and never brought
 into the House. A second scheme, however, though it ultimately
 failed, too, had at least more publicity, some of the about-town
 rumours concerning it being carefully recorded by Pepys -

"It seems there is great presumption that there will be
 a Toleration granted: so that the Presbyterians do hold up
 their heads; but they will hardly trust the King or the
 Parliament what to yield them, though most of the sober
 party be for some kind of allowance to be given them."

Colonel Birch -

"tells me that the King is for Toleration, though the
 Bishops be against it: and that he do not doubt but it will
 be carried in Parliament; but that he fears some will stand
 for the tolerating of Papists with the rest; and that he
 knows not what to say, but rather thinks that the sober party
 will be without it, rather than have it upon those terms;
 and I do believe so."

A few days later our diarist heard that an Act was likely to pass,
 allowing all persuasions to hold public worship -

"An Act of Comprehension is likely to pass this Parlia-
 ment, - for admitting of all persuasions in religion to the
 public observation of their particular worship, but in cer-
 tain places, and the persons therein concerned to be listed
 of this, or that Church; which, it is thought, will do them
 more hurt than good, and make them not own their persuasion."⁸

There was, however, more in it than rumour - great names were
 busy - Sir Orlando Bridgeman, the Lord Keeper and Sir Matthew
 Hale, the Lord Chief Baron. The Earl of Manchester, too, appar-
 ently looked favourably on the scheme while, among the clergy, the
 leading /

leading names were Bishops Wilkins and Reynolds and Dr. Burton. The actual proposals being drawn up by Wilkins and Burton we are, perhaps, justified in heading this chapter "The Wilkins and Burton Accommodation." On the Presbyterian side, the representatives were Manton and Bates - and, of course, Baxter. In some cases these are new names - but they were, all of them, of the school of the accommodationists. Bridgeman had been one of the King's commissioners at the Uxbridge negotiations, where, though the son of a bishop, he displayed such a tendency to compromise in church matters, and so lawyer-like a desire to meet political opponents halfway, that he incurred the censure both of Charles and of Hyde. The trial of the regicides he had conducted, too, - and that at a time when, if ever, political partisanship might have been expected to run riot - with remarkable moderation.⁹ Hale, a great name, had a deservedly high reputation, also, for moderation. A staunch Puritan throughout his life, he showed, for example, a certain tenderness in the administration of the Conventicle Acts, in 1651, too, he had defended the Presbyterian Christopher Love, one of his last acts in the House of Commons being to introduce a bill for the comprehension of Presbyterians - a bill thrown out on the second reading on November 28, 1660. He was friendly, we know, with Baxter - indeed, for a period, lived close by his home, Baxter giving us an interesting pen-portrait of him. "He was", he says, "on terms of intimacy with Wilkins, bishop of Chester, with whom he was associated in his efforts to secure the comprehension of the dissenters, with Barrow, master of Trinity College, /

College, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Ussher, and other eminent divines." ^{10.} He was, therefore, well within the accommodation circle. Hezekiah Burton, while quite a fresh name in our study, had been a leading influence among the accommodationists for some time, Anthony Wood, indeed, declaring that "a club formed by Wilkins to promote comprehension used to meet at the 'chambers of that great trimmer and latitudinarian, Dr. Hezekiah Burton.'" ¹¹ Pepys makes some mention of him, ^{12.} as also does Birch, the latter giving this description - "He had likewise a just and lively sense of the vast concernment and importance of religion, both to the private and public, the present and future, the temporal and eternal happiness of mankind; which made him seek out all sorts of arguments to convince them of the absolute necessity and unspeakable advantages of religion, and all kinds of motives and inducements to persuade and allure them to the practice of it; and so, by one consideration or other, he might take hold of all capacities and tempers of men." ^{13.}

But for us the most important figure undoubtedly is John Wilkins, appointed bishop of Chester in this very year of our study - 1668. Admittedly, he is not in the first rank of the accommodationists - he is no Stillingfleet or Baxter - all the same, he takes a deservedly high place. An influential man, a Warden of Wadham, Oxford, a Master of Trinity, Cambridge, one of the group, indeed, who formed the Royal Society, of a scientific bent, too, he was, says Aubrey - "a very ingenious man, and had a very mechanicall head. He was much for trying of experiments, and /

and his head ran much upon the perpetuall motion." ¹⁴ Anthony Wood's description of him tells us that "upon the breaking out of the rebellion, he closed with the presbyterians, having always before been puritanically affected and took the covenant" and further that "he took the engagement, that is, to be faithful to the commonwealth of England." ¹⁵ Wilkins' record, it would seem, was no heroic one ¹⁶ for Wood continues - "I cannot say to the contrary that there was any thing deficient in him but a constant mind and settled principles." ¹⁷ But this apart, he appears to have been a kindly man, beloved of Evelyn who describes him as "my deare and excellent friend Dr. Wilkins." ¹⁸ Burnet, too, seems to have been favourably impressed -

"At Cambridge he joined with those who studied to propagate better thoughts, to take men off from being in parties, or from narrow notions, from superstitious conceits, and a fierceness about opinions. He was also a great observer and a promoter of experimental philosophy, which was then a new thing, and much looked after. He was naturally ambitious, but was the wisest clergyman I ever knew. He was a lover of mankind, and had a delight in doing good." ¹⁹

In theology Wilkins has usually been classed among the Latitudinarians.

Such, then, was the moving spirit of the 1668 accommodation.

Charles' Breda Declaration was the basis, ²⁰ the general scheme being as follows -

1. That such persons as in the late times of disorder had been ordained only by Presbyters, should be admitted to the exercise of the ministerial function, by the imposition of the hands of the Bishop, with this or the like form of words; "Take thou (legal) authority to preach the Word of God and to administer the sacraments in any congregation of the Church of England when thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereto."

2. That clergymen and school-masters (after taking the Oaths of Allegiance or Supremacy) should be required to subscribe this or the like form of words: "I, A. B., do hereby profess and declare that I do approve the doctrine, worship, and government established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation; and that I will not endeavour, by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any doctrine contrary to that which is so established: and I do hereby promise, that I will continue in the communion of the Church of England, and will not do anything to disturb the peace thereof."

3. That kneeling at the sacrament, the use of the cross in baptism, and bowing at the name of Jesus might be left indifferent or be altogether omitted; Barlow being willing to class with these things the wearing of the surplice.

4. That in case it should be thought fit to review and alter the Liturgy and Canons for the satisfaction of Dissenters, then every person admitted to preach should - upon admission - publicly and solemnly read the said Liturgy, openly declare his assent to the lawfulness of using it, and give a promise that it should be constantly read at the time and place accustomed. ²¹.

Such was the Episcopal set of proposals, there being further liturgical and ceremonial items which we need not reproduce.

The Presbyterians, however, made certain modifications which can be thus summarized -

1. That all ministers ordained by Presbyters should, when admitted by the Bishop to minister in the Church, "have leave," if they "desired" it, to "give in their profession, that they renounce not their ordination nor take it for a nullity, and that they take this as the magistrate's license and confirmation."

2. That in the form of subscription they should assent to the truth of all the Holy Scriptures, to the articles of Creed, and to the doctrine of the Church of England contained in the Thirty-six Articles; or to the doctrinal part of the Thirty-nine Articles, excepting only the three articles touching ceremonies and prelacy.

3. That an appeal be allowed for a suspended minister from the Bishop to the King's Courts of Justice; and lastly, that certain rules be enacted for the due enforcement of /

of discipline, respecting admission to holy communion, and also respecting meetings for worship. A few additional suggestions were proposed, relating to alterations in the Liturgy. ²²

These we need not detail. It is well to note, in passing, that the scheme had a relationship to the Independents as well as to the Presbyterians. These, upon registering their names, were to be allowed to worship in public, and to build edifices to that end. Although disabled from holding public offices, they were to be fined for not fulfilling them, and also compelled, "according to their respective qualities", to pay annually for indulgence, a sum not above forty shillings, nor under ten, for any master of a family; not above eight, nor under two, for any other individual - the tribute to form a fund for church building. Upon producing a certificate, nonconformists were to be exempted from legal penalties for non-attendance at parish worship; but they were to pay church rates, and it was suggested by Barlow that they should be forbidden to preach against the Establishment. This arrangement was to be limited to three years, and to be confined to such Protestants as are described in Cromwell's Act of Settlement. ²³

After considerable debate a Bill of Comprehension was drawn up by Sir Matthew Hale. The points comprised were, first, the insertion of the word "legal" before the word "authority" instead of the demanded liberty to declare the validity of the previous Presbyterian ordination; and secondly, the omission of the clause proposed by Baxter and his friends relating to appeals. Two forms /

forms of subscription, framed so as to exclude Romanists, were likewise adopted respectively for established ministers and for tolerated persons.

However, again all good intentions were frustrated.²⁴ Bishop Wilkins, in bringing the scheme to the notice of Bishop Ward of Salisbury²⁵ did his cause no good but unconsciously brought about its failure, for the latter promptly used all his resources to bring it to nought. Aided, too, by Archbishop Sheldon, he was successful.²⁶ It can be questioned, however, if this accommodation ever had any real chances of success, - Wilkins' concessions being tentative and timid, certainly not going the length of Presbyterian requirements. Wilkins was never a Stillingfleet.

In conclusion, it is rather curious to note that two historians have gone egregiously astray over this accommodation - Burnet²⁷ and Birch²⁸ both connecting the names of Tillotson and Stillingfleet with it - a plain mistake.²⁹

XXIII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. pp. 347 & 348.
2. Do. p. 348.
3. Do. pp. 348 & 349.
4. Do. p. 355.
5. State Papers. News Letter. Sep. 1667.
6. Printed in Thorndike's Works. Vol. V. p. 302.
7. Diary. Under dates Jany. 20 & 31, 1668.
8. Do. Under date Feb. 5, 1668.
9. D.N.B. Vol. VI. Article "Orlando Bridgeman."
(Osmund Airy). pp. 318 & 319.
10. D.N.B. Vol. XXIV. Article "Matthew Hale". (J.M. Rigg).
pp. 18, 19 & 20.
According to Anthony Wood he actually took the Covenant in
1643. Athenae Oxonienses. Vol. III. Column 1091.
11. D.N.B. Vol. VIII. Article "Hezekiah Burton". (Leslie
Stephen). p. 8.
12. Pepys. Under dates 24 April, 1659-60 & 1 Feb. 1661-2.
13. Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. p. 125.
14. Aubrey's Brief Lives. Vol. II. pp. 299 & 300.
15. Anthony Wood. Athenae Oxonienses. Vol. III. Column 967.
16. J.H. Overton. Life in the English Church.
"There is Bishop Wilkins, who, though he certainly cannot
be reckoned among the consistent and heroic type of
churchmen, was eminent in many ways:- for his great
scientific attainments, for his tolerance in an intoler-
ant age, for his liberality, for his general kindness,
and especially for his kindness to royalists and church-
men in perilous times, though he did not cast in his lot
with them." p. 35.
17. Athenae Oxonienses. Vol. III. Column 968.
18. Diary. Under date 10 July, 1654.
See also Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. p. 6.
19. History of his Own Time. One Vol. Ed. 1883. p. 127.
Similar evidence can be seen in Henry Newcome's Diary, under
date Nov. 22, 1672 - also in Adam Martindale's Auto-
biography. p. 196.
20. Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. p. 42.
21. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 382 seq.
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. p. 25.
Archdeacon Barlow, later Bishop of Lincoln, made careful
memoranda of the scheme.
22. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 385.
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. p. 24.
23. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 385.
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. p. 25.
24. Orme. Works of Richard Baxter. Vol. I. p. 270.
25. D.N.B. Vol. LIX. Article "Seth Ward." (E. Irving
Carlyle).
"Although /

"Although Ward was in favour of rendering the English Church more comprehensive by modifying the professions required from conformists, he was distinguished for his activity against dissenters." p. 338.

Despite the fact he gave strenuous support to the Conventicle Act and the Five-Mile Act he showed many deeds of individual kindness.

Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. pp. 84 & 86.

cf. Aubrey. Brief Lives.

"As he is the pattern of humility and courtesie, so he knowes when to be severe and austere; and he is not to be trampled or worked upon." Vol. II. p. 287.

Ward's eulogistic biographer, Pope, says -

"He believed if the growth of them were not timely suppressed, it would either cause a necessity of a standing army to preserve the peace or a general toleration which would end in popery."

Life of Seth Ward. Ed. 1697. p. 68.

26. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. pp. 385 & 386.

27. History of his own Time. One Vol. Ed. 1883. p. 175.

28. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. p. 42.

29. D.N.B. Vol. LVI. Article "John Tillotson". (Alexander Gordon). p. 392.

XXIV.

TILLOTSON, STILLINGFLEET and BAXTER - 1675.

The failure of the Wilkins-Burton Accommodation was, indeed, a disappointment yet nothing in our narrative is to be admired more than the unquenchable optimism of the men of this school, men with an ideal, men who simply refused to be disobedient to the vision. Failures there might be, but failures merely meant the renewal of endeavours. Aided, too, they were by the fact that in the King they had one with no small sympathy. Indeed, in the autumn of 1688, he granted an audience, at the Earl of Arlington's lodgings, to a few Presbyterian clergymen, this interview being described by Dr. Manton in a letter to Baxter. The interview was -

"very gracious; He was pleased once and again to signify, how acceptable our Address was, and how much he was persuaded of our Peaceableness; saying, that he had known us to be so ever since his return; promised us, that he would do his utmost to get us comprehended within the Publick Establishment, and would remove all bars, for he could wish that there had been no Bounds nor Bars at all, but that all had been Sea, that we might have had liberty enough; but something must be done for publick Peace: However, we could not be ignorant, that this was a work of difficulty and time, to get it fully effected for our Assurance: And therefore we must wait till Businesses could be ripened. In the mean time he wish'd us to use our Liberty temperately, and not with such open Offence and Scandal to the Government: He said our Meetings were too numerous, and so (besides that they were against Law) gave occasion to many clamorous People to come with complaints to him, as if our design was wholly to undermine the Church; and to say, Sir, These are they that you protect against the Laws."

"He seemed to be well enough pleased, when I suggested that our Sobriety of Doctrine, and meddling only with weighty things, and rememnt in the Hearts of his people, and that possibly people of another humour might season them with worse infusions: then Arlington pluck'd him by the Coat, as desiring him to note it."

The /

The optimism is further exemplified by a letter, dated June 24, 1670, of Baxter to the Earl of Lauderdale. After bewailing the divisions of the land and the grievous results to King, People and Church, he emphasized the fact that such a sin - such is his term - should cease.

"I am persuaded, That if there were first a Command from His Majesty to the Bishops of Chester and Norwich on one side, and two Peaceable Men on the other, freely to Debate and offer such Expedients as they think most proper to heal all our Divisions, they would soon agree: And when they had made that Preparation, if some more such Moderate Divines were joyned to them (as Dr. Stillingfleet, Dr. Tillotson, Dr. Outram, Dr. Pierson, Dr. Whitcot, Dr. More, Dr. Worthington, Dr. Wallis, Dr. Barlow, Dr. Tully, Mr. Gifford, &c. on one side; and Dr. Conant, Dr. Dillingham, Dr. Langley, and many more that I could Name on the other side;) they would quickly fill up, and confirm the Concord."²

How typical a Baxter letter is this and how incurably optimistic! The King, moreover, was soon to show his persistence in the policy of toleration by the issue on March 15, 1672 of a new Declaration of Indulgence - on the face of it, a just and wise offer. The clergy of the Church were required exactly to obey the Prayer Book, but it suspended all penal laws against dissenters, allowing Protestants to meet in public and Romanists in private³ - a Declaration promptly condemned as illegal by Parliament - and so corroborated by Lord Keeper Bridgeman - the King being forced to withdraw it. The hope of toleration, accordingly, for the time being, at least, was at an end. Instead, came the Test Act of 1673 - an act which compelled all holders of civil, naval, or military office to receive the Holy Communion according to the rites of the Church of England, and to make a declaration against transubstantiation. /

transubstantiation. Toleration, we know, did not meet the wishes of Presbyterians - they desired comprehension, toleration to them meaning an open door to Popery. Besides, such a policy, they argued, would entail the permanence of Protestant dissentions, whereas comprehension would unite and consolidate. Meanwhile, the Commons were ready to pass a toleration Bill for Protestant dissenters, but the Lords refused it.⁴

At this juncture it was that Baxter came to the forefront again. In his letter of December 15, 1673 he broached the subject of accommodation to the Earl of Orrery.

"I have here drawn up those Terms on which I think Ministers may be restored to the Churches Service, and much union and quietness be procured: But I must tell you. 1. That upon second Thoughts I forebore to distribute them, as I intimated to you, into several Ranks; but only offer what may tend to a Concord of the most, though not of every man. 2. That I have done this only on the suppositions that we were fain to go upon in our Consultation with Dr. Wilkins, viz. That no change in the Frame of Church-Government will be consented to: Otherwise I should have done as we did in 1660, offered you Arch-bishop Usher's Reduction of the Government to the primitive state of Episcopacy; and have only desired that the Lay-Chancellours have not the Power of the Keys, and that, if not in every Parish, at least in every Rural Deanery, or Market-Town, with the adjacent Villages, the Ministers might have the Pastoral power of the Keys so far as is necessary to guide their own Administrations, and not one Bishop, or Lay-Chancellor's Court to have more to do than Multitudes can well do, and thereby cause almost all true Discipline to be omitted."⁵

In particular, Baxter's proposals of comprehension were these -

"Meeting-houses of dissenters should be allowed as chapels, till there were vacancies for them in the churches - and that those who had no meeting-houses should be school-masters or lecturers till such time - that none should be obliged to read the Apocrypha - that parents might have liberty to dedicate their own children in baptism - that ministers might preach where somebody else who had the room might read the common-prayer - that ministers be not obliged to /

to give the sacrament to such as are guilty of scandalous immoralities, nor to refuse it to those who scruple kneeling - that persons excommunicated may not be imprisoned and ruined and that toleration be given to all conscientious dissenters."⁶

These proposals eventually came into the hands of Bishop Morley, of whom Baxter had some hopes - mistakenly, however, he says, all his professions for abatement and concord being deceitful snares, intending no such thing.⁷

And so the effort failed.

Another attempt, however, quickly ensued - in 1675 - an attempt which brings together a trio of supreme interest in our study - Tillotson, Stillingfleet and Baxter, all of whom figured, it will be recalled, in our study of the Accommodationist Thinkers. These three - not to mention others - made a powerful team. Despite this, however, it has to be confessed, success did not come their way. No doubt the fear of Popery was the compelling force behind the movement - but it was hardly one that was likely to cement real and lasting measures of comprehension. Bates, we are told, brought a message from Tillotson, stating that he and Stillingfleet desired a meeting with Manton, Pool, Baxter and himself on the subject of comprehension.⁸ The Presbyterians met to consider whether such an attempt was safe and prudent, or whether it was a snare. Baxter honoured and had faith in Hitchcot, Stillingfleet, Gifford, Tillotson, Cradock and Outram - but with Morley it was otherwise. According to Birch,⁹ Tillotson and Stillingfleet met with Baxter alone with whom they agreed on a particular draft - a draft which was duly agreed to by the Presbyterians. /

Presbyterians. Those formerly ordained 'by parochial pastors only' were now to be authorized by 'a written instrument', purposely ambiguous. The bishops, however, refused to assent to many particulars in it and Baxter's final appeal to Tillotson was in vain. Indeed, the last-named, apparently overawed by the opposition, seemed inclined to withdraw from the movement. On April 11, 1675 actually he addressed a letter, so signifying, to Baxter, thus summarized by Neal -

"He was unwilling his name should be made public in the affair, since it was come to nothing: not but that I do heartily desire an accommodation (says he), and shall always endeavour it: but I am sure it will be a prejudice to me, and signify nothing to the effecting the thing which, as circumstances are, cannot pass in either house without the concurrence of a considerable part of the bishops, and the countenance of his majesty, which at present I see little reason to expect." ^{10.}

In the circumstances it is difficult not to agree with Orme -

"It is irksome to record these constantly recurring schemes of comprehension and union, from which nothing whatever resulted. Tillotson and Stillingfleet appear to have been sincere, while neither Morley nor Ward was so; and thus, after various meetings and discussions, Baxter, who had taken the trouble of drawing up a "Healing Act", and several petitions or addresses to the king, which were never used, was left only with the comfort of reflecting that he had conscientiously sought that peace, which others either wanted the will or the power to promote." ^{11.}

Tillotson, of course, had not retracted. He preached at the Yorkshire feast (3 Dec. 1678) in favour of concessions to nonconformist scruples. ^{12.} In 1689, too, we shall see him playing an honourable role. Meanwhile, we have to record that 1675 had failed as signally as 1668. Baxter was bitterly disappointed. Is there some truth, we wonder, in the criticism that he was greater in criticism than in conciliation? ^{13.}

XXIV. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. p. 37.
2. Do. pp. 77 & 78.
3. Printed in full in Bunyan's Works. Vol. III. Edited
George Offor. p. 21.
Also in Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV.
p. 407 seq.
cf. p. 410.
"Some maintained, that it (Charles' Declaration) was
setting up altar against altar, and that they should
accept of nothing but a comprehension. Others
endeavoured to prove, that it was the duty of the
Presbyterians to make use of the liberty granted them
by the king, because it was their natural right, which
no legislative power upon earth had a right to deprive
them of, as long as they remained dutiful subjects;
that meeting in separate congregations distinct from
the parochial assemblies, in the present circumstances
was neither schismatical or sinful. Accordingly most
of the ministers, both in London and in the country,
took out licences."
4. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 419 seq.
Burnet. History of his own Time. One Vol. Ed. 1883.
p. 230.
5. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. pp. 109 & 110.
Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 425.
Orme says of Orrery -
"Formerly Lord Broghill, under which title he is gener-
ally spoken of by Baxter, and other writers of that
period. He was a very distinguished man, and probably
sincerely desirous on this occasion to promote the good
of the country, and the benefit of the Nonconformists,
to whom he was a steady friend."
Baxter's Works. Vol. I. p. 302.
Baillie had a high regard for Orrery.
He "gained more on the affections of the people than
all the English that ever were among us."
(i.e. Scotland).
Journals. Vol. III. p. 315.
6. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 425.
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. p. 110 seq.
7. Orme. Baxter's Works. Vol. I. p. 303.
Of Morley Overton says -
"His Calvinism did not prevent him from taking as active
a part against the Presbyterians at the Savoy Conference
as Sheldon, Cosin, and Gunning did; but his antagonism
did not interfere with his showing kindness to some of
his antagonists."
Life in the English Church. 1660-1714. p. 25.

- Baxter's answers to Morley are drawn out to a wearisome -
and futile - length.
8. Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. pp. 113-140.
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. p. 157.
9. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. p. 43.
For the 'Healing Act' see Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III.
p. 158 seq.
10. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 430.
Given in full in Reliquiae Baxterianae. Part III. p. 157.
Calamy's Abridgement. Vol. I. p. 343.
Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. pp. 43 & 44.
There was widespread feeling against the Church of England
negotiations.
"They were frowned on by most of the bishops and aspersed
by their clerical brethren, who reviled them as traitors
to the Church whose bread they were alleged to eat while
they lifted up their hands against her."
Molesworth. History of the Church of England.
pp. 65-67.
11. Orme. Baxter's Works. Vol. I. p. 310.
12. D.N.B. Vol. LVI. Article "John Tillotson". (Alexander
Gordon). p. 392.
13. Alfred Plummer. English Church History. From Death of
Charles I. to the Death of William III. p. 56.

1689 - THE GREAT ACCOMMODATION.

We now reach the culminating accommodation of seventeenth-century English Church History viz:- that of 1689, the most fateful and important of all.

Between 1675 and 1689, of course, there had been further attempts. Towards the end of 1680, for example, John Howe had met Bishop Lloyd (of St. Asaph, not of Norwich) at Tillotson's house. In answer to the query as to what concessions would satisfy the majority of the dissenters Howe had replied that a very considerable obstacle would be removed, if the law were so framed as to enable ministers to attempt parochial reformation. "For that reason", said the Bishop, "I am for abolishing the lay Chancellors as being the great hindrance of such reformation." Next day Howe and Bates, together with Tillotson, were liberally entertained by Stillingfleet at the Deanery of St. Paul's, Lloyd otherwise engaged, not being present. Three days afterwards, however, - November 18 - a scheme of comprehension appeared in Parliament.

Says Neal -

"The parliament being inclined to relieve the Nonconformists, appointed a committee November 18, who agreed upon a comprehension with the dissenters, upon much the same terms with those already mentioned; they were to subscribe the doctrinal articles of the church: the surplice was to be omitted, except in cathedrals and the king's chapel; the ceremonies to be left indifferent. And as for such Protestants as could not be comprehended within these terms, they were to have a toleration, and freedom from the penal statutes,

statutes, upon condition of subscribing a declaration of allegiance, &c. and of assembling with open doors. Bishop Burnet says, the bill for a comprehension was offered by the episcopal party in the house of commons, but that the friends of the dissenters did not seem forward to promote it, because, as Mr. Baxter observes, they found the bill would not go; or if it had passed the commons, it would have been thrown out by the bishops in the house of lords; the clergy, says Kennet, being no farther in earnest than as they apprehended the knife of the Papists at their throats." ²

The Bill, however, was dropped - little wonder in the prevailing spirit of Laodiceanism. "To the amazement of all people," says Burnet, "their (the Presbyterians') party in the house did not seem concerned to promote it: on the contrary they neglected it. This increased the jealousy, as if they had hoped they were to near the carrying all before them, that they despised a comprehension." ³

Undoubtedly, a disturbing factor was Stillingfleet's reaction, 1680 being also the year of his famous sermon on "The Mischief of Separation." A very different spirit obtained here from what was displayed in the "Irenicum". The constitution of the church, he said, could not be perfect and, therefore, there must be inconveniences for some. "A universal toleration is that Trojan Horse which brings in our enemies without being seen, and which after a long siege they hope to bring in at last under the pretence of setting our gates wide enough open to let in all our friends." A rather unworthy sermon this, and one which makes us appreciate how natural was the battery of replies elicited, such as the second edition of Humfrey and Lobs' "The Peaceable Design Renewed" and John Howe's "A Letter written out of the Country." Stillingfleet's rejoinder was "The Unreasonableness of Separation" (1680 or 1681), a work which shows

a singular lack of appreciation of the Nonconformists' position, they being described by the author as "an enraged, but unprovoked, company of men." ⁴ Toleration, he asserted, means an open door to the Roman Catholics - an old argument. Moreover, there was an obligation of submission to the authority of the National Church - but that, surely, was a point at issue. It is a pity that Stillingfleet's fair name, to some extent, at least, has been spoiled by these two works - apparently, however, he was subject to such reactionary fits. As an accommodationist, we need not be surprised, he was now suspect, having done the cause no small harm.

A really potent factor and an influence towards the Accommodation of 1689 was the growth of Latitudinarianism. Already known to us are exponents themselves in the persons of Burnet, Tillotson, Wilkins and Stillingfleet. In addition, however, were Edward Fowler and Daniel Whitby, both of moment and interest in our study. The former's "Free Discourse" (1670) claimed that Episcopacy, while the best form of church government, is not indispensable, and that the "latitude-men" held that magistrates must be obeyed when they command things inconvenient if lawful - yet are they "not more for obedience to lawful commands of authority, than desirous that mercy should be shown to those whose consciences will not permit them to comply with their governors in some things disputable." ⁵ With the Revolution, Fowler, we know, was of opinion that the time had come for the consolidation of the Protestant interest by a comprehension of the dissenters. ⁶ Daniel Whitby, notorious for his theological /

theological changes, is well worthy of remembrance in our study by his "The Protestant Reconciler humbly pleading for condescension to Dissenting brethren in things indifferent". (1683) - a self-explanatory title. "Things indifferent", he argued, should not be made legal barriers to union among Protestants.⁷

Opinions of this kind - and they were growing - were conducive to an "accommodation" atmosphere⁸ in 1689.

Perhaps, too, its importance justifies us in making mention of the schools of Naturalism. Already have we not seen Stillingfleet in the "Irenicum" appealing to the law of Nature? When men argued, as they did, that no one could be punished unless he violated the precepts of natural religion an altogether new outlook was being engendered.

While, however, the latitudinarian movement was conducive to the accommodation spirit of the time there was - as a force to counteract it - the known opposition of the High Church party; nevertheless, the accommodationists had high hopes of Sancroft, the successor of Sheldon as Archbishop. True, he was a High Churchman, but in a spiritual rather than a political sense.⁹ While, too, an ardent admirer of Laud he yet showed a remarkable tenderness to the dissenters - although, as we have already seen, Burnet did not entertain a high opinion of him.¹⁰ That he was interested in comprehension and wider church union is clear from his correspondence with Dr. John Covel, chaplain to the Princess of Orange and later Master of Christ's College, Cambridge. "I should count it my joy and the crown of my rejoicing," he wrote, "if I could contribute anything, /

anything, besides my daily prayers, 'ut videat Deus et requirat,' towards restoring and advancing them to a yet better condition"; but, he goes on, "whatever, becomes of your project or mine, or any particular scheme, I can by no means, as our brethren seem to do, give up the whole Protestant cause as lost and desperate and ready to breathe its last. No! God hath by the Reformation kindled and set up a light in Christendom which I am fully persuaded shall never be extinguished." ¹¹

Unfortunately, little is known of Sancroft's comprehension, we requiring to get our information largely at second-hand. Fear of Rome and distrust of King James brought Churchmen and Nonconformists together. Indeed, in the petition presented by the seven bishops, it was declared that there was no want of "due tenderness to Dissenters, in relation to whom they were willing to come to such a temper, as should be thought fit, when that matter should be considered and settled in parliament and convocation." ¹²

Further, a circular letter of Sancroft to his clergy may be cited as evidence.

"That they also walk in wisdom towards them that are not of our Communion more especially that they have a very tender regard to our brethren, the Protestant Dissenters; that upon occasion offered, they visit them in their houses, and receive them kindly at their own, and treat them fairly wherever they meet them, discoursing calmly and civilly with them, persuading them, if it may be, to a full compliance with our Church And, in the last place, that they warmly and most affectionately exhort them to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of Peace for the universal blessed union of all Reformed Churches, both at home and abroad, against our common enemies, that all they who do confess the Holy Name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the truth of His Holy Word, may also meet in one Holy Communion, and live in perfect unity and godly love." ¹³

On January 14, 1689 a meeting was held at Tillotson's house, to bring about a closer union, Lloyd declaring that he and his friends had Sancroft's approval - "we agreed that a bill should be prepared to be offered by the bishops, and we drew up the matter of it in ten or twelve heads." ¹⁴

Our knowledge of this accommodation, indeed, is largely known to us through Wake's account given at the time of Sacheverell's trial.

"The time was towards the end of the late unhappy reign, when we were in the height of our labours in defending the church of England against the assaults of popery, and thought of nothing else. At this time, that wise prelate (Sancroft), foreseeing a revolution such as that which soon after occurred, began to consider how utterly unprepared they had been at the restoration of King Charles II. to settle many things to the advantage of the church, and what a happy opportunity had been lost, for want of such previous care, for its more perfect establishment. It was visible to all the nation that the more moderate dissenters were generally so well satisfied with that stand which our divines had made against popery . . . as to express an unusual readiness to come within the pale of the church. And it was therefore thought worth while . . . to consider . . . what might be done to gain the more moderate dissenters without doing any prejudice to ourselves. The scheme was laid out, and the several parts of it were committed, not only with the approbation but by the direction of that great prelate, to such of our divines as were thought most worthy to be entrusted with it. His Grace took one part himself . . . The design was in short this: to improve and if possible amend our discipline; to review and enlarge our liturgy, by correcting some things, by adding others, and . . . by omitting some few ceremonies . . . so as not to make them of necessity binding on those who had conscientious scruples respecting them . . . And if things alterable be altered upon the grounds of prudence and charity, . . . whilst the doctrine, government, and worship of the church remain entire in all the substantial parts of them, we have all reason to believe that this will be so far from injuring the church, that on the contrary it will receive a great benefit from it." ¹⁵

Sancroft - naturally enough, as Archbishop - was cautious, being afraid that Lloyd and the others might go too far in the granting /

granting of concessions. A man of the highest Christian idealism, he just did not quite have the necessary driving force to make the accommodation successful.¹⁶ So Tillotson it was who eventually came into the forefront. His fear of Rome was sincere, intensifying, as it did, his efforts to comprehension. "I allow Dr. Tillotson and many others of the Church of England to have been its bulwark against popery" - so wrote an ardent admirer.¹⁷

Indeed, Tillotson's appreciation of the dissenters was one of the helpful and hopeful features in all the negotiations. "A great man (i.e. Tillotson) of our Church once said, that these men, meaning the Puritans, had more of the Christian Spirit and came nearest to the sanctity of the Apostles of any set of men that had ever lived in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age."¹⁸ No doubt was there about his popularity. "Pray God", run the glowing words of another admirer, "send a good man in the room of the worthy late Arch-bishop (Tillotson); so I call him, and I hope all people now thinks the same. Pray, my Lord, have regard to a man that wond (won't) be too strict with us rigid Presbyterians; for I can't suffer persecution, no more than my friend the Bishop of Sarum (Burnet) can the Scotch Bootes."¹⁹

Unfortunately, King William - whose comprehension ideals were well known - made a false start. Instead of going to the clergy in the first place he had a bill for the union of his Majesty's Protestant subjects introduced to the Upper House. It was proposed that a committee consisting equally of divines and laymen should prepare the terms of comprehension - a proposal opposed by Burnet who /

who feared the procedure. The bill was checked, however, in the Lower House.

"Those who had moved for this bill, and afterwards brought it into the house, acted a very disingenuous part; for, while they studied to recommend themselves by this shew of moderation, they set on their friends to oppose it; and such as were very sincerely and cordially for it, were represented as the enemies of the church, who intended to subvert it. When the bill was sent down to the house of commons, it was laid on the table; and, instead of proceeding in it, they made an address to the king, for summoning a convocation of the clergy to attend, according to custom, on the session of parliament. The party that was now beginning to be formed against the government, pretended great zeal for the church, and declared their apprehensions that it was in danger, which was imputed by many to the earl of Nottingham's management. These, as they went heavily into the toleration, so they were much offended with the bill of comprehension, as containing matters relating to the church, in which the representative body of the clergy had not been so much as advised with.

Nor was this bill supported by those who seemed most favourable to the dissenters; they set it up for a maxim, that it was fit to keep up a strong faction both in church and state; and they thought it was not agreeable to that, to suffer so great a body as the presbyterians to be made more easy, or more inclinable to unite to the church; they also thought that the toleration would be best maintained when great numbers should need it, and be concerned to preserve it; so this good design being zealously opposed, and but faintly promoted, it fell to the ground." 26

So writes Burnet. (History of his own Time. p. 531).

In the Commons, it is further explained by Stoughton, "but few Nonconformists, not more than twenty or thirty Presbyterians, could be counted among the members. The vast majority were Churchmen, some, Tory Churchmen, looking with a sinister eye upon the whole affair, some, Whig Churchmen, liberal in a limited degree, but opposed to the principle of Dissent." (Religion in England. Vol. V. p. 87).

Tillotson, however, persevered. He persuaded the King - and
this /

this was in accordance with public feeling - to appoint a committee to deal with the matter - which, accordingly, was done - the result being the most powerful accommodation team ever drawn together in England in the seventeenth century, consisting of ten bishops and twenty divines.²¹ We are, perhaps, justified in detailing the names - names drawn from all parties in the church. The bishops were Dr. Thomas Lamplugh, Archbishop of York; Dr. Henry Compton, Bishop of London; Dr. Peter Mew of Winchester; Dr. William Lloyd of St. Asaph; Dr. Thomas Spratt of Rochester; Dr. Thomas Smith of Carlisle; Dr. Jonathan Trelawney of Exeter; Dr. Gilbert Burnet of Salisbury; Dr. Humphrey Humphreys of Bangor; and Dr. Nicolas Stratford of Chester. The twenty divines were Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, Dean of St. Paul's, and soon after Bishop of Worcester; Dr. Simon Patrick, Dean of Peterborough, and soon after Bishop of Chichester; Dr. John Tillotson, Dean of Canterbury, and soon after of St. Paul's; Dr. Richard Meggot, Dean of Winchester; Dr. John Sharp, Dean of Norwich; Dr. Richard Kidder, soon after made Dean of Peterborough; Dr. Henry Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford; Dr. William Jane, Regius-Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford; Dr. John Hall, Margaret Professor of Divinity in the same University; Dr. Joseph Beaumont, Regius-Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; Dr. John Montagu, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; Dr. John Goodman, Archdeacon of Middlesex; Dr. William Beveridge, Archdeacon of Colchester; Dr. John Battely, Archdeacon of Canterbury; Dr. Charles Alston, Archdeacon of Essex; Dr. Thomas Tenison, Archdeacon /

Archdeacon of London; Dr. John Scott, Prebendary of St. Paul's; Dr. Edward Fowler, Prebendary of Gloucester; Dr. Robert Grove, Prebendary of St. Paul's and Dr. John Williams, Prebendary of St. Paul's.²²

This was, indeed, a powerful team - such names as Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Burnet, Beveridge, Tenison,²³ Compton, Patrick, Sharp and Grove would have graced any body to which they belonged.

Tillotson, as the prime mover, drew up a paper containing concessions which would probably be made by the Church of England for the union of Protestants - a copy of which he entered in his common-place book -

"1. That the ceremonies injoin'd or recommended in the liturgy, or canons, be left indifferent.

2. That the liturgy be carefully reviewed, and such alterations and changes therein made, as may supply the defects, and remove, as much as is possible, all ground of exception to any part of it, by leaving out the apocryphal lessons, and correcting the translation of the psalms, used in the public service, where there is need of it; and in many other particulars.

3. That instead of all former declarations and subscriptions to be made by ministers, it shall be sufficient for them, that are admitted to the exercise of their ministry in the church of England, to subscribe one general declaration and promise to this purpose, viz. that we do submit to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the church of England, as it shall be established by law, and promise to teach and practise accordingly.

4. That a new body of ecclesiastical canons be made, particularly with a regard to a more effectual provision for the reformation of manners both in ministers and people.

5. That there be an effectual regulation of ecclesiastical courts, to remedy the great abuses and inconveniences, which by degrees, and length of time, have crept into them; and particularly, that the power of excommunication be taken out /

out of the hands of lay officers, and placed in the Bishop, and not to be exercised for trivial matters, but upon great and weighty occasions.

6. That for the future those, who have been ordained in any of the foreign reformed churches, be not required to be re-ordained here, to render them capable of preferment in this church.

7. That for the future none be capable of any ecclesiastical benefice or preferment in the church of England, that shall be ordained in England, otherwise than by Bishops. And that those, who have been ordained only by Presbyters, shall not be compelled to renounce their former ordination. But because many have, and do still doubt of the validity of such ordination, where episcopal ordination may be had, and is by law required, it shall be sufficient for such persons to receive ordination from a Bishop in this or the like form: 'If thou art not already ordained, I ordain thee', &c. as in case a doubt be made of any one's baptism, it is appointed by the liturgy, that he be baptised in this form, 'If thou art not baptised, I baptise thee', &c." ²⁴

The diligence of the Commission was exemplary - it held no less than eighteen meetings in six weeks ²⁵ and proposed some 598 amendments. Different, assuredly, was the spirit displayed now from what had obtained at the Savoy Conference and indeed, long before at the Hampton Court Conference!

Before them lay the works of nonconformists from Elizabeth's time to their own, in which exceptions had been taken to the services and the constitution of the Church. Assuredly, there was an endeavour to get at the facts. Nothing, indeed, could have exceeded the conscientious, scrupulous and conciliatory spirit of the members. The concessions were certainly liberal, with a strong bent to Presbyterianism - the disuse of the Apocrypha in public worship; the change of the word "priest" to "minister", and of "Sunday" to "Lord's Day", throughout the Prayer Book; the omission of everything objectionable on grounds of delicacy or Romish /

Romish superstition in the baptismal, burial, marriage, and other services, Presbyterian ordination to be held hypothetically valid; the use of the surplice, of the sign of the cross at baptism, and of kneeling at Communion to be left optional, or settled by the discretion of the Bishop in any case of refusals by parties; the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed to be put on a more satisfactory basis.

Assuredly, all seemed set for success - and yet, as we shall see, failure was to be the lot of this accommodation too. The conciliatory spirit, it has to be confessed, was more apparent than real. "Already", says Stoughton, "it appeared that the reverend and right reverend Commissioners were sitting on barrels of gunpowder."²⁶ Rifts began to be visible in the unity. Bishops Sprat and Mew absented themselves from the sittings, Drs. Aldrich²⁷ and Jane withdrew.²⁸ The attendance, however, was still considerable, and always included five or six bishops, Burnet, Tillotson and Tenison distinguishing themselves by never being absent. The Commission finished its labours on 10th November and on the 21st Convocation met. The Upper House, on the whole, was well disposed to unity. Sancroft, being under suspension, Compton it was who presided - a member in favour of a conciliatory policy. In the Lower House, however, there was a different spirit. The High Church and Jacobite party had succeeded in having Dr. Jane, of Oxford, elected prolocutor - a fatal appointment for the liberal party. "Our Convention for settling religion", says one disappointed writer, "is likewise broken in pieces, for our presbyterian /

presbyterian party hoped Dr. Tillotson would have been chosen Prolocutor, or their man, as they call him, but the vote being between him and Dr. Jean, the latter had it. Dr. Tillotson was one that would have granted us all we could have wished for, both in the alteration of the liturgies, prayers, ceremonies, and all. But this Jean is so stiff for the Church of England, that he will grant nothing."²⁹ It was with difficulty, even, that the Lower House could be prevailed on to consent to an address to the King. All the pleadings of the Bishop of London were in vain. The atmosphere was altogether hostile. Jane, according to custom, says Birch, made "a speech in Latin, in which he extoll'd the excellency of the church of England, as establish'd by law, above all Christian communities, intimating, that it wanted no amendment, and concluding with the application of this sentence by way of triumph, 'Nolunus leges Angliae mutari'".³⁰ Accommodation - quite obviously - was receding. Convocation, accordingly, was prorogued until the January of next year, when, with Parliament, it was dissolved, no attempt thereafter being made to revive the subject. The Great Accommodation had failed.

One wonders what the reason was and how to apportion the blame. "The responsibility", says Stoughton, "must be divided. It is difficult to get at a complete knowledge of the views and aims of different parties interested in the subject. A spirit of intrigue, a habit of insincerity, and the employment of double-dealing, which cast clouds around what was in many respects a "glorious Revolution", influenced those who took part in the proceeding." /

proceeding." ³¹ Compton's and Burnet's motives, certainly, were above reproach. Those of the Earl of Nottingham, however, Stoughton doubts. ³² "The whole atmosphere", he says, "seems to have been laden with duplicity; and when the measure came down to the Lower House, with the apparent sanction of the Upper, there is reason to believe that if not the parents, yet the nurses and sponsors of the Bill had no objection to have the child killed in its cradle." ³³

There was, too, a widespread suspicion of the Nonjurors who were suspected of favouring the comprehension in order that they might claim for themselves the right to be the true orthodox remnant.

"The jacobite clergy, who were then under suspension, were designing to make a schism in the church, whensoever they should be turned out and their places should be filled up by others. They saw it would not be easy to make a separation upon a private and personal account, they therefore wished to be furnished with more specious pretences; and, if we had made alterations in the Rubric and other parts of the Common Prayer, they would have pretended that they still stuck to the ancient church of England, in opposition to those who were altering it and setting up new models."

So writes Burnet ³⁴ - a charge indignantly denied by the Nonjurors.

As we have seen, the strength of the Latitudinarians was on the side of comprehension. Unfortunately, however, that party was strong only in London and the larger towns. The clergy in general were against comprehension, while many of the sects, such as the Baptists and the Quakers, opposed the Establishment altogether.

It can be doubted, too, if as many desired comprehension as their /

their leaders imagined,³⁵ the fact being they had grown to be powers in themselves and were conscious of the fact. The proposed accommodation, it is plain, would have left out more Nonconformists than it would have taken in, the Independents, Baptists and Quakers being together more numerous than the Presbyterians.

Comprehension, then, was plainly impossible - toleration, accordingly, was the alternative adopted - the Toleration Act being passed without difficulty on 24th May, 1689. Yet toleration was never the ideal that comprehension was. All dispassionate students of accommodation are at one in regretting as much as King William himself did that the Great Accommodation of 1689 failed. For thus came to an end the last strong and deliberate effort in the seventeenth century to include the dissenters within the National Fold. "But this much", says Calamy, "I shall venture to say, that such Amendments as these were, with such an Allowance in the Points of Orders, for Ordination by Presbyters, as is made 13 Eliz. Cap. 12; would in all Probability have bro't Two Thirds of the Dissenters in England. Which being done, and at the same Time a Liberty continu'd to such as could not be Comprehended, would have been greater Service to Religion than can easily be imagin'd."³⁶

Howe, too, joined in the lamentation over the failure - as did Baxter and Philip Henry. Thoresby's lament, we can see, was the lament of many -

"What a deplorable case are we reduced to, that so many attempts for reformation (i.e. comprehension) have been unsuccessful, particularly that most famous in the beginning of the late reign, 1689, when so many incomparable persons, of /

of primitive candour and piety, were concerned therein; of which my lord Archbishop of York has spoke to me with deep concern; for which disappointment all good Christians have the deeper cause of sorrow, because we are positively told that in all probability it would have brought in two-thirds of the Dissenters in England. Lord send on Thy Holy and Peaceable Spirit to influence the hearts of such as have power in their hands to heal our piteous breaches in Thy due time." ^{37.}

The fact is that the removal of the fear of Rome in 1689 had broken up the alliance of churchmen and dissenters. While, too, it may be true that comprehension was debated in Convocation in 1702, the state of feeling in Anne's reign was entirely against it. The Great Accommodation had failed. ^{38.}

XXV. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Rogers' Life of John Howe. pp. 191 & 192.
2. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. IV. p. 460.
The pros and cons of the arguments are summarized on p. 461.
See also Reresby's Memoirs. (Ed. Cartwright). p. 194.
3. Burnet. History of his own Time. 1883. 1 Vol. Ed.
p. 326.
4. Preface. xxxix.
5. cf. Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson.
"His gentleness towards the Dissenters was attended with the consequence intended by him of reconciling many of them to the communion of the established church, and almost all of them to a greater esteem of it, than they had before entertain'd of it."
p. 352.
6. D.N.B. Article "Edward Fowler". (Alexander Gordon).
Vol. XX. p. 84.
7. D.N.B. Article "Daniel Whitby". (Alexander Gordon).
Vol. LXI. p. 28.
Considerable popularity had attended Whitby's earlier controversial efforts; he lost it by putting forth anonymously, late in 1682 "The Protestant Reconciler", pleading for concessions to nonconformists, with a view to their comprehension. Later he issued a "second part" of the "Protestant Reconciler", urging dissenters to conformity.
8. Anthony Wood speaks favourably of him - Athenae Oxonienses.
cf. Baxter's account of the early Latitudinarians.
"A second sort of Conformists were those called Latitudinarians, who were mostly Cambridge men, Platonists or Cartesians, and many of them Arminians with some Additions, having more charitable Thoughts than others of the Salvation of Heathens and Infidels, and some of them holding the Opinions of Origen about the Preexistence of Souls, &c. These were ingenious Men and Scholars, and of Universal Principles, and free; abhorring at first the Imposition of these little things, but thinking them not great enough to stick at when Imposed. Of these, some (with Dr. Moore their Leader) lived privately in Colledges, and sought not any Preferment in the World: and others set themselves to rise."
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 386.
9. J.H. Overton. The Nonjurors. p. 32.
10. Ante. pp. 255 & 256.
11. D'Oyley. Life of Sancroft. Vol. I. p. 118.
12. Cardwell. A History of Conferences. p. 401.
13. D'Oyley. Life of Sancroft. Vol. I. p. 196.
- Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. V. p. 58.
14. Patrick. Autobiography. Works. Ed. 1858. Vol. IX.
pp. 516 & 517.

15. D'Oyley. Life of Sancroft. Vol. I. pp. 197 seq.
16. Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. p. 316.
17. H.M.C. Ancaster MSS. 1907. p. 442.
For the fear of Rome see Neal. History of the Puritans.
Vol. V. pp. 36 & 37.
18. H.M.C. 14th Report. Appendix. Part IX. Onslow MSS.
1895. p. 497.
19. H.M.C. Buccleuch MSS. Vol. II. Part I. 1903.
p. 171.
20. Burnet. History of his own Time. One Vol. Ed. 1883.
p. 531.
21. Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. p. 180 where the
terms of the commission are printed.
22. Do. pp. 181 & 182.
23. D.N.B. Article "Thomas Tenison". (W.H. Hutton).
Vol. LVI.
In "An Argument for Union", 1683, he urged the dissent-
ers to "do as the ancient nonconformists did, who would
not separate though they feared to subscribe." (p. 42).
He became prominent for his "moderation towards dissent-
ers". (See his Discourse concerning the Ecclesiastical
Commission open'd in the Jerusalem Chamber, October 10,
1689), having been already employed by Sancroft to con-
sider a possible revision of the Book of Common Prayer.
He had long considered the difference between the church
and the more moderate dissenters to be easy of recon-
ciliation. (cf. his Argument for Union, e.g. pp. 4-5,
where he comments on the impossibility of the presbyter-
ians agreeing with "Arians, Socinians, Anabaptists,
Fifth Monarchy-men, Sensual Millenariés, Behmenists,
Familists, Seekers, Antinomians, Ranters, Sabbatarians,
Quakers, Muggletonians, Sweet Singers; these may assoc-
iate in a caravan, but cannot join in the communion of
a church.")
pp. 58 & 59.
Calamy said he "was even more honoured and respected by the
dissenters than by many of the established church."
Life. ii. 334.
24. Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. pp. 182-184.
The conservatives argued that the hypothetical formula
would be evasive - Burnet proposed, however, that it
should be explicitly stated that both the ordainer and
the ordained reserved their opinions.
These papers were inaccessible until recent years. Calamy
knew of their existence, but could not see them. Ten-
ison desired them to be deposited in the Lambeth Library,
but to be kept secret. They were published, on the
motion of James Heywood, M.P., in Parl. Papers 283,
Sess. 1854.
The proceedings were detailed in a diary kept by Dr.
Williams.
25. The Commissioners met for the first time on October 3, at 9
o'clock /

- o'clock in the Jerusalem Chamber (17 out of the 30 being present) and continued almost daily till 18 November.
26. Stoughton. Religion in England.
Vol. V. The Church of the Revolution. p. 101.
27. D.N.B. Article "Henry Aldrich". (Leslie Stephen).
Vol. I. p. 25.
28. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. V. p. 80.
cf. Mallam. Constitutional History.
"It was the policy of the court to withstand a comprehension of dissenters; nor would the bishops admit of any concession worth the other's acceptance. The high-church party would not endure any mention of indulgence."
p. 721.
29. Calendar of State Papers. Domestic. William and Mary.
13th Feb. 1689 - April 1690. p. 325.
30. Birch. Life of Dr. John Tillotson. p. 202.
Burnet. History of his own Time. One Vol. Ed. 1883.
p. 543.
31. Kennett. iii. p. 552.
Stoughton. Religion in England.
Vol. V. The Church of the Revolution. p. 86.
32. Do.
33. Do. p. 87.
34. Burnet. History of his own Time. One Vol. Ed. 1883.
p. 544.
- Cardwell. A History of Conferences. p. 422.
cf. E.R.E. Vol. IX. Article "Nonjurors" (C.J.B. Gaskoin).
"Some of them condemned the National Church as now schismatic". p. 394.
35. cf. Gwatkin.
"The greater the success of comprehension, the greater the danger for those not comprehended. Indeed, the men who raised the Sacheverell riots (1710) and passed the Schism Act (1714) were quite capable of repealing the Toleration Act. Thus the Comprehension Bill was attacked on both sides - by the High-churchmen who hated the idea, and by the dissenters who feared its success - and the Whigs were divided, one section of them wanting comprehension, the other preferring to relax the Test Act."
Cambridge Modern History. Vol. V. ch. xi.
Religious Toleration in England. p. 337.
cf. Macaulay.
"There was consequently a division in the Whig party. One section of that party was for relieving the dissenters from the Test Act, and giving up the Comprehension Bill. Another section was for pushing forward the Comprehension Bill, and postponing to a more convenient time the consideration of the Test Act. The effect of this division among the friends of religious liberty was that the High Churchmen, though a minority in the House of Commons and not a majority in the House of

of Lords, were able to oppose with success both the reforms which they dreaded. The Comprehension Bill was not passed and the Test Act was not repealed." History of England. Vol. I. p. 704.

36. Calamy's Abridgement. p. 448.
 But cf. Stoughton. Religion in England. Vol. V. The Church of the Revolution.
 "No doubt a considerable number might have been satisfied, but I consider Calamy to have been too sanguine in his expectation; his expectation resting mainly on what he knew of Presbyterians, who were much more disposed to return to the establishment than were brethren of other denominations."
 p. 105.
- cf. J.R. Green. Short History of the English People.
 "At no time had the Church been so strong or so popular as at the Revolution, and the reconciliation of the Nonconformists would have doubled its strength."
 p. 651.
37. Ralph Thoresby's Diary. Ed. 1830. Vol. I. p. 400.
 38. Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. V. p. 84.

PART III.

I R E L A N D.

XXVI.

PRESBYTERY in EPISCOPACY.

THE EARLY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH of IRELAND.

We now come to the last part of our present enquiry - the accommodation movement between Presbytery and Episcopacy in Ireland. The story here will not be so long as in the cases of Scotland and England but, in many ways, it will prove as interesting. The most noticeable feature, perhaps, is the fact that a form of accommodation was in operation practically 'ab initio.' Moreover, to Ireland must be given the honour of producing, in the person of Archbishop Ussher, the greatest and most famous of all the accommodationists.

Usual it is to say that Presbyterianism was introduced into Ireland from Scotland in the seventeenth century, some¹ giving the period as the years following the great rebellion of 1641 and others² the years after the Ulster plantations. The statement may be taken as roughly correct, though the first regular Provost of Trinity College, Dublin,³ in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was a Presbyterian, as were also two of its first fellows. Traces, too, of a church order, characterized by the simplicity and freedom of Presbyterianism, it must be admitted, already existed. All the same, in the main, it is no mistake to say that the organization of the present Irish Presbyterian Church can be dated from the early seventeenth century, the Plantation of Ulster being the cause of its firm establishment. The plan of settlement was drawn /

drawn up by the celebrated Lord Bacon, its execution being entrusted to Lord Deputy Chichester and Sir John Davies, the Attorney-General. Into the details of the scheme, however, it is not necessary to enter. Suffice it to say that many Scotsmen took part. No doubt some were of an inferior character. Reid quotes Blair to that effect -

"Although amongst those whom Divine Providence did send to Ireland, there were several persons eminent for birth, education, and parts; yet the most part were such as either poverty, scandalous lives, or, at the best, adventurous seeking of better accommodation had forced thither, so that the security and thriving of religion was little seen to by those adventurers, and the preachers were generally of the same complexion with the people." ⁴

Nevertheless, many were of such excellent character that Ulster, which had fewer natural advantages than Munster, Leinster and Connaught became the most prosperous, the most industrious and the most law-abiding part of Ireland. "Having found by experience", said the King to Oliver St. John, "that plantations in that kingdom are the only ordinary means to reduce the people to civility and religion, he (the King) is the more desirous to see them proceeded in with due diligence and care." ⁵ The Plantation of Ulster, however, as a political event, does not interest us - it is more apposite to our purpose to note that it led to the foundation of the Scoto-Irish Presbyterian Church, for while, as we have seen, Presbyterians had existed in Ireland, there had been, as yet, no organized Presbyterianism. To Ulster, then, came from the Scottish Church, between 1613 and 1630 a stream of men on whose heads the succeeding years have placed a halo of sanctity as the fathers of Irish Presbyterianism. It is well to note some of their names, together /

together with some facts concerning them, having in view particularly their suitability as members of 'Presbytery within Episcopacy.'

First, mention may be made of Edward Brice, brother of the laird of Airth, formerly minister of Drymen, in Stirlingshire, who, as an object of persecution, had had to flee to Ireland, where he settled at Broadisland. At the synod of Glasgow on August 18, 1607 he had bitterly opposed the appointment of the archbishop - Spottiswood - as permanent moderator, in accordance with the King's recommendation, adopted by the General Assembly at Linlithgow on December 10, 1606.^b There is no record of his reordination^c - indeed, in 1619 he was so far favoured in Episcopal eyes as to be promoted to the prebendary of Kilroot.

Next, we name Robert Cunningham. He had been chaplain to the Earl of Buccleuch's Regiment in Holland, but, removing to Ireland on the return of the troops to Scotland, he was, on November 9, 1615 admitted to the ministry by Bishop Echlin, serving for a considerable period as curate of Holywood and Craigavard. "He was", asserts John Livingstone, "the one man to my discerning, of all that ever I saw, who resembled most the meekness of Jesus Christ in all his whole carriage, and was so far revered by all, even the most wicked, that he was oft troubled with that Scripture, 'Wo to you when all men speak well of you.'"^d Adair also spoke highly of him.

"There was in the next parish - Holywood - a very godly man, Mr. Robert Cunningham, with whom he (Blair) became intimately acquainted, to both their comfort and edification. They often visited one another, and spent many hours - yea, days - in prayer. Mr. Cunningham became singular and eminent in holiness and usefulness in the ministry, in a greater degree by Mr. Blair's coming to Ireland."^e

We now mention James Hamilton, nephew of Lord Claneboy. He had been educated for the ministry, but did not seek ordination. Blair and Cunningham, however, appreciating his suitability, proposed he should do so. Says the former in his autobiography -

"Being then chamberlain to the Lord Viscount Claneboy, his uncle, Mr. Cunningham and I put him to private essays of his gift, and being satisfied therewith, invited him to preach publicly at Bangor in his uncle's hearing, he knowing nothing till he saw him in the pulpit; for we feared he would be unwilling to part with so steady and faithful a servant. But having heard him publicly, he put great respects upon him that same day; and shortly thereafter 'Mr. Hamilton' entered to a charge in the holy ministry, wherein he was painful, successful, and constant, notwithstanding, he had many temptations to follow promotion which he might easily have attained; but the Lord graciously preserved him from these baits, and made him very successful and instrumental in setting forward the work of the Lord, both in his own charge and elsewhere also, when he got a call."¹⁰

Bishop Echlin it was who ordained him." He was appointed to the cure of Ballywalter.

Next comes Josias Welsh, son of the celebrated John Welsh, minister of Ayr and, accordingly, grandson to John Knox himself. Says Adair -

"The Lord was also pleased to bring over from Scotland Mr. Josias Welsh, the son of Mr. John Welsh, that famous man of God, who, both in Scotland and France, was rarely instrumental for converting and confirming the souls of the people of God. A great measure of that spirit which wrought in and by the father, rested also on the son. Mr. Blair, meeting with him in Scotland, and perceiving of how weak a body, and of how zealous a spirit he was, exhorted him to haste over to Ireland, where he would find work enough, and, he hoped, success; and so it came to pass; for he, being settled at Templepatrick, became a blessing to that people; and, being under great exercise of spirit, spoke vehemently to convince the secure, and sweetly to comfort the cast down."¹²

Welsh, 'the Cock of the Conscience', it is important to note for our present study, was ordained by his kinsman, Bishop Knox of Raphoe.¹³

Andrew Stewart now commands our attention. "A well-studied gentleman and fervent in spirit", declares Blair, "he was settled at Donagore, and prospered well in the work of the Lord. But his ministry was of short endurance, he dying in the midst of our trials."¹⁴ His son - of similar name - was the author of a brief "History of the Church of Ireland" - a work of much use to our purpose.¹⁵

Next, we name George Dunbar of Larne, who had been twice ejected from his charge at Ayr, and subsequently imprisoned at Blackness for Presbyterian persistency.¹⁶

In addition, was John Livingstone of Killinchy, after Blair, the most celebrated Presbyterian minister in the Established Church. For our study his ordination is of great importance, his own version being as follows -

"About August 1630, I got letters from the Viscount of Clannybuie to come to Ireland in reference to ane call to the paroch of Killinshie, whether I went, and got an very unanimous call from the paroch; and because it was needfull that I should be ordained to the ministrie, and the Bishop of Doun, in whose bounds Killinshie was, was an corrupt and timorous man, and would require some engagement, therefore my Lord Clannybuie sent some with me, and wrote to Mr. Andrew Knox, Bishop of Rapho, who when I came and gave him the letter from my Lord Clannybuie, and from the Earle of Wigtoun, and some others, that I had for that purpose brought out of Scotland; he told me that he knew my errand that I had to him, because I had scruple against Episcopacie and ceremonies, according as Mr. Josias Welsh and some others had done before, and that he thought his old age was prolonged for little other purpose but to doe such offices, that if I scrupled to call him my Lord he cared not much for it; all he would desyre of, because they got there but few sermons, (was,) that I would preach there at Ramallen the next Sabbath, and he would send for Mr. William Cunninghame, and some two or three other neighbouring ministers, to be present, who after sermon should give me imposition of hands; but although they performed the work, he behoved to be present, for otherwise he durst not answer it to the State. He gave me the book of ordination, and /

and desyred that any thing I scrupled at I should draw an lyne over it in the margine, and Mr. William Cunninghame should not read it; but I found it had been soe marked by some others before that I needed not mark any thing. So the Lord was pleased to carry that business far beyond any thing that I had thought or almost ever desyred." ¹⁷

This, together with parallel narratives from other sources, as we shall see, is highly illuminating for the study of the setting of Irish Presbytery within Episcopacy.

These early ministers, of course, were not all Scotsmen - there were Englishmen too, such as Mr. Hubbard, Henry Colwort and John Ridge. Hubbard was episcopally ordained, ¹⁸ so was Colwort, ¹⁹ as also Ridge. ²⁰

It is well to note in passing that the Scottish influence in the Irish Protestant Episcopal Establishment was equally marked - in 1610, for example, no less than five sees were occupied by Churchmen of Scottish birth, ²¹ Derry and Clogher by George Montgomery, Raphoe by Andrew Knox, a kinsman of the Reformer, Down and Connor by James Dundas, whose two successors, Echlin (1612) and Leslie (1636), were of the same nationality. The somewhat facile and easy comprehensive views, too, are worthy of comment. For example, referring to Knox Bagwell says - he "was not over particular about the regularity of orders, and many Presbyterians were preferred by him." ²² Writes Reid, too -

"Though like the English Puritans, in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth, they were comprehended within the pale of the established Episcopal Church, enjoying its endowments and sharing its dignities, yet notwithstanding this singular position which they occupied, they introduced and maintained the several peculiarities, both of discipline and worship, by which the Scottish Church was distinguished." ²³

This truly is an interesting situation for our study.

It will have been noticed that no detailed mention has been made of Robert Blair, the greatest of the group of these early Presbyterian ministers. For this, however, there is a reason. Round his figure has waged the controversy as to whether there was any comprehension of Irish Presbytery and Episcopacy. We therefore reserve this subject for the next chapter.

XXVI. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. e.g. Prof. James Cooper in "Confessions of Faith and Formulas of Subscription".
 "Presbyterianism was introduced into Ireland in 1642 by some ministers from Scotland who accompanied, in the capacity of chaplains, the Scottish soldiers sent to aid in the suppression of the Irish Rebellion. These men found a ready audience among the Scottish settlers in Ulster."
 p. 17.
 e.g. John Dall in E.R.E. Article "Presbyterianism".
 Vol. X.
 "Presbyterianism in Ireland took its rise among the colonists who were settled in Ulster after the abortive rebellion of the early 17th century."
 p. 255.
2. Hamilton. History of the Irish Presbyterian Church. p. 36.
- Moffat. The Presbyterian Churches. p. 73.
3. An Epoch of Irish History. Trinity College, Dublin.
 J.P. Mahaffy. p. 86.
4. Cowan. The Scottish Church in Christendom. p. 234.
- Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
 Vol. I. p. 97.
5. Calendar of State Papers. Ireland. James I. 1615-1625.
 Under date Feb. 26, 1620. p. 275.
 Neal pays tribute to their achievements in History of the Puritans. Vol. II. p. 89.
 Some writers have deplored the religious results of the Plantation. Naturally Mant is one.
 "Of this plantation there was one result deeply to be lamented, as disturbing the Church's peace, impeding her progress, and diminishing her power of promoting religious improvement. The emigrants from Scotland, who were a numerous division of the new settlers, brought with them their own peculiar prepossessions, and were attended or followed by ministers of their own, apparently sincere and zealous, though mistaken men, earnest in maintaining and disseminating their national opinions." Vol. I. p. 365.
 "A schism was thus established among the Irish Protestants: a schism, opposed at the same time to all the principles and laws of the Church Catholick, and injurious to Christianity in general, but especially detrimental under the circumstances of Ireland, where a consentient, combined, and co-operating effort, in the one regular body of the national church, by all the opponents of the papal errors, might have been a powerful instrument in God's hand for correcting them."
 Vol. I. pp. 367 & 368.

But so also Dunlop.

"Unfortunately, the establishment of a compact body of zealous Presbyterians in a country preponderatingly Catholic has served to vastly complicate the Irish problem."

- A History of Ireland. p. 91.
6. D.N.B. Article "Edward Brice." (Alexander Gordon).
Vol. VI. p. 311.
7. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 98.
8. "A worthy minister" says Adair. True Narrative. p. 20.
Memorable Characteristics.
Select Biographies. Vol. I. p. 325.
9. Adair. True Narrative. p. 9.
10. Stewart. History of the Church of Ireland. p. 318.
Blair. Life. p. 65.
11. Adair. True Narrative. p. 12.
Stewart. History of the Church of Ireland. pp. 318 & 319.
D.N.B. Article "James Hamilton." (Robert Dunlop).
Vol. XXIV.
"Accordingly in 1626, notwithstanding his presbyterian proclivities and heterodox views, which resembled Blair's own in regard to episcopacy, he was ordained by Bishop Echlin."
p. 183.
12. Adair. True Narrative. pp. 20 & 21.
Blair. Life. p. 75.
Howie. Scots Worthies. p. 152.
13. Blair. Life. p. 75.
14. Blair. Life. p. 81.
Livingstone adds -
"Mr. Andrew Stewart, minister at Dunagor, a man very straight in the cause of God, continued not long in his ministry, but contracted sickness, and dyed some years before the great scattering came upon the North of Ireland."
Memorable Characteristics.
Select Biographies. Vol. I. p. 328.
15. Adair. True Narrative. p. 26.
Witherow. History of the Literary Memorials of Presbyterianism in Ireland. p. 26.
D.N.B. Article "Andrew Stewart." (Thomas Hamilton).
Vol. LIV. p. 272.
16. Livingstone. Memorable Characteristics.
Select Biographies. Vol. I. p. 327.
Adair. True Narrative. p. 21.
Stewart. History of the Church of Ireland. p. 318.
Blair. Life. p. 76.
17. Livingstone. Life.
Select Biographies. Vol. I. p. 141.
D.N.B. Article "John Livingstone." (G.W. Spratt).
Vol. XXXIII. p. 402.
Adair. /

- Adair. True Narrative. p. 26.
 Blair. Life. p. 81.
 Livingstone's Autobiography and "The Memorable Characteristics" are most useful for our present study.
 See Witherow. History of the Literary Memorials of Presbyterianism in Ireland. p. 22.
18. Reid. Vol. I. p. 99.
 After Hubbard, James Glendinning, a Scotsman, preached in Carrickfergus. He is stated to have been an incumbent of Coole. Reid. Vol. I. p. 99.
19. By Bishop Knox of Raphoe. Reid. Vol. I. p. 115.
20. By the Bishop of Oxford. Reid. Vol. I. p. 100.
21. Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. I. pp. 489 & 490.
 cf. Bagwell. Ireland under the Stuarts.
 "Always glad to promote his own countrymen, James I. appointed them to Irish bishoprics: they in their turn ordained others, often without much inquiry as to their views on church government."
 p. 231.
22. Bagwell. Ireland under the Stuarts. p. 231.
 Knox's life is interesting.
 cf. D.N.B. Article "Andrew Knox". (Robert Dunlop). Vol. XXXI.
 "On 2 April 1606 (the episcopacy having been restored in Scotland) Knox was created bishop of the Isles, and having obtained leave from the presbytery, he immediately proceeded to his diocese."
 "In January 1606-7 he was appointed constant moderator of the presbytery of the Isles, and on 4 June he took the oath of allegiance."
 p. 306.
23. Reid. Vol. I. p. 130.

XXVII.

THE CASE of ROBERT BLAIR.

We have seen the names of some of the earliest Irish Presbyterians. We have seen, too, that no few Scottish licentiates who settled in Ireland early in the seventeenth century received ordination from the Bishops of Ulster according to the Presbyterian manner, the most notable instance so far mentioned being that of Livingstone. Those parts of the established ritual, be it recalled, to which he objected were omitted, Bishop Knox of Raphoe coming in among the neighbouring Presbyterian ministers as one of themselves and joining in the imposition of hands. And, as with Livingstone so with Hamilton, Blair and others. A historic fact this is - vouched for by Episcopalians themselves. Says Ieland, for example -

"On the plantation made in the reign of James the new colonists had been supplied with teachers principally from Scotland. They formed their churches on the Presbyterian model, and many refused to accept Episcopal ordination. To quiet such scruples, the bishops, by the approbation of Ussher, their learned metropolitan, consented to ordain them to the ministry, without adhering strictly to the established form, and to submit some of their brethren of the Scottish Presbytery to a participation of their office. Thus the Scottish teachers enjoyed churches and tithes without using the liturgy." ²

A much less dispassionate person, perhaps, is Heylyn but he can be brought forward as a witness.

"The adventurers of the Scottish nation brought with them hither such a stock of Puritanism, such a contempt of bishops, such a neglect of the public liturgy, and other divine offices of this church, that there was nothing less to be found amongst them than the government and forms of worship established in the Church of England Not contented with the articles of the Church of England, they were resolved to frame a Confession /

Confession of their own; the drawing up whereof was referred to Dr. James Ussher by whom the book was so contrived that all the Sabbatarian and Calvinian rigours were declared therein to be the doctrines of that church and finally such a silence concerning the consecration of archbishops and bishops (expressly justified and avowed in the English book), as if they were not a distinct order from the common Presbyters. All which, being Ussher's own private opinions, were dispersed in several places of the articles for the Church of Ireland, approved of in the Convocation of the year 1615, and finally confirmed by the Lord Deputy Chichester in the name of King James." ³

Despite these writers, however, others have striven to disprove the facts we have narrated, their attacks in particular being aimed at Blair's account of his own ordination. Into Robert Blair's history, of course, we need not enter. Suffice it to say he was the most distinguished of these early Presbyterian ministers, a faithful and loyal pastor at Bangor. ⁴ His story of the ordination is in these words -

"The Lord Viscount Claneboy (who of a gentleman became a knight, thereafter a viscount, and died Earl Clanbrissel), procured my admission to the ministry, having before, at my desire, informed the bishop Echlin how opposite I was to Episcopacy and their Liturgy; and, for fear he had not been plain enough, I declared the same myself at our first meeting. Notwithstanding he was most willing I should be planted there, saying: 'I hear good of you, and will impose no conditions upon you; I am old, and can teach you ceremonies, and you can teach me substance. Only I must ordain you, else neither I nor you can answer the law, nor brook the land.' I told him that was contrary to my principles; to which he replied, both wittily and submissively, 'Whatever you account of Episcopacy, yet I know you account a presbyter to have divine warrant; will you not receive ordination from Mr. Cunningham and adjacent brethren, and let me come in amongst them in no other relation than a presbyter?'" ⁵

Bishop Mant in his "History of the Church of Ireland" questions the truth of this narrative - not, however, I think, very successfully. His argument is to the effect that the Regal Visitation Book of the diocese of Down and Connor, containing the record of the /

the ordination by Bishop Echlin of Blair in 1623 and of Livingstone in 1630, takes no notice of any deviation from the regular form of ordination as prescribed by law - "that is, the form of ordination, contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and no other, prescribed by the Act of Uniformity, 2nd year of Elizabeth, chap. 2, with a solemn charge of obedience on all archbishops and bishops, as they will answer before God for their neglect." ^b But this surely proves too much. It is hardly likely that the Visitation Book would make any reference to the departure from the usual procedure. At any rate, that it does not is no disproof of Blair's narrative. As a matter of fact, it is known that many of the terms of the Act of Uniformity were not observed. Mant admits so himself. ⁷ Blair's account does not stand alone. There is Livingstone's also - not to mention Adair's and Stewart's. ⁸ How could they expect deliberately mendacious accounts to be accepted? No writer before Mant seems ever to have thought of questioning the veracity of Blair and Livingstone.

Ussher's biographer, Dr. C.R. Elrington, however, is a doubter.

"At this period, if we are to give credit to the Presbyterian writers, Archbishop Ussher exerted himself not merely to grant their ministers toleration, but to countenance them in occupying parishes as their lawful incumbents, yet refusing to conform to the Liturgy. It is stated confidently, that when Bishop Echlin of Down suspended two remarkable Puritans, Blair and Livingston, Blair appealed to the Primate, who immediately desired the Bishop to relax his erroneous censure. The whole narrative is suspicious in the extreme."

So he writes. ⁹ Yet Livingstone ¹⁰ had given an account similar to Blair's. To Elrington "that Archbishop Ussher should countenance what was too flagrant a breach of discipline for Bishop Echlin to pass /

pass over, is not within the limits of credibility." " He adduces, however, no proof.

In another point the same writer has questioned Blair's truthfulness. The reference is to the following passage of the autobiography -

"When Primate Usher came back to Ireland, my patron, desirous that I should be acquaint with him, took me in his company, where a meeting of the nobility and gentry of Ulster was to be, where he received me very kindly, and desired me to be at his table while I was in town. The next day coming to dinner, I met with the English Liturgy in his family; but I came not again, leaving my excuse with my patron, that I expected another thing in the family of so learned and pious a man than the reading of the Liturgy. But he excused the matter by reason of the great confluence that was there; but he entreated me that I would be at the pains to come to Trodaff, where his ordinary residence was, where he would be more private, and at leisure to be better acquainted with me. I obeyed the desire, and was made welcome. He was very affable and communicative. In conference he desired to know of me what my mind was concerning the nature of justifying and saving faith. I told him my mind, that I held the accepting of Jesus Christ as he is offered in the gospel, &c. With this he was well satisfied, confirming the same in a large discourse, clearing the matter by the similitude of a marriage, wherein it is not the sending or receiving of gifts that made the marriage, but the accepting of the person. Hereby I was much refreshed. From this he passed on to speak of ceremonies; tried my mind therein, saying that he was afraid that our unsatisfiedness therein might endanger our ministry, and it would break my heart if that successful ministry in the north should be interrupted and marred. 'They think,' said he, 'to cause me stretch out my hand against you; but all the world shall never move me to do so.' When he had drawn forth my mind thereanent, he said, 'I perceive you will never be satisfied therein; for still you enquire what ought to be done. I confess all these things you except against might come yea, ought to be removed, but that cannot be done.' I replied that I had read all those arguments used by Mr. Sprint, in a treatise entitled 'Cassander Anglicanus; or, A Necessity of Conformity in case of Deprivation;' and I had seen all these fully answered in a treatise entitled 'Cassandra Scotica; or, A Necessity of Nonconformity in hope of Exaltation.' Our conference being ended, he dismissed me very kindly, though I gave him no high styles at all, and proved thereafter very friendly when trouble came on us - as will appear in this subsequent discourse." ¹²

"The very narrative itself contains many circumstances notoriously false", curtly says Elrington,¹³ appealing to Bernard, Ussher's chaplain.

"Dr. Bernard, giving a detail of the arrangements of the house at Drogheda, states, that morning and evening prayers, according to the liturgy, were read every day, and that the Archbishop never failed to attend except prevented by illness; and he also adds, that there were no Protestants in Drogheda who scrupled at the use of the cross in baptism, or kneeling at the communion table, or the like, but 'in all things conformed to what they saw was approved by him.'" ¹⁴

But this evidence is of little worth - Blair speaking of 1627 and Bernard¹⁵ of 1634. Apart from that, however, what reason was there to doubt that Ussher made some changes in his household in deference to his guest? Free prayer could quite well be the rule in his own house.

The discussion of this chapter has not been altogether a digression for, plainly, had Mant and Elrington disproved Blair's narrative - with those of the others - the accommodation we have claimed as existing in Ireland in those days between Presbytery and Episcopacy would have been disproved too. The evidence, however, is such as to show that the comprehensive environment was there 'ab initio' - a feature we have observed in our Irish study, a feature which, however, did not uninterruptedly last. With the antagonistic and persecuting policy of Bishops Robert Echlin and Henry Leslie, indeed, it received a rude shock.¹⁶

Modern writers - it may be noted - do not now adopt the attitude and arguments of Mant and Elrington. They incline rather to admit the facts while regarding the methods of the Presbyterians as unworthy. "Such equivocal types of ordination as these were hardly /

hardly honourable either to the bishops concerned or to the ordinands. Dr. Mant's scorn of Livingstone's attribution to the special pleasure, the signal interposition and agency of God, of a fraud practised on the Church of Ireland, is at the least understandable. Nor did the instances mentioned stand alone; there were several others, though less prominent. And the extraordinary circumstance of Presbyterian ministers deliberately taking their places in the ministerial ranks of an episcopal Church was followed by another circumstance no less extraordinary, viz. that they employed, and felt that God approved of their employing, in that ministry the Presbyterian discipline, contrary to the injunctions of the Church in which they held office." ¹⁷ So Dr. G.V. Jourdan.

We turn next to look at the subject from the point of view of the Irish Episcopal Church - the Establishment.

XXVII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Livingstone. Life.
Select Biographies. Vol. I. p. 141.
2. Leland. History of Ireland. Vol. II. p. 481.
3. Heylyn. History of the Presbyterians. Book XI. p. 388.
4. Adair. True Narrative.
Livingstone. Memorable Characteristics.
Select Biographies. Vol. I. p. 323.
5. Blair. Autobiography. pp. 58 & 59.
6. Mant. History of the Church of Ireland. Vol. I. p. 453.
cf. Calendar of State Papers, Ireland. Charles I.
(1625-32). p. 662. No. 2116.
7. Mant. History of the Church of Ireland. Vol. I. p. 338.
8. Adair. True Narrative. p. 7.
Stewart. p. 318.
9. Elrington. Ussher's Works. Vol. I. p. 146.
10. Livingstone. Life.
Select Biographies. Vol. I.
"The Primate very cheerfully dealt for us with the bishop,
so as we were at that time restored."
p. 145.
11. Elrington. Ussher's Works. Vol. I. p. 147.
12. Blair. Autobiography. pp. 79 & 80.
13. Elrington. Ussher's Works. Vol. I. p. 148.
14. Do. pp. 148 & 149.
15. Bernard - a Vicar of Bray - was none too trustworthy.
16. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 131 seq.
Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. II.
p. 23 seq.
17. Adair. True Narrative. p. 21 seq. & p. 33 seq.
History of the Church of Ireland. Ed. W.A. Phillips.
Vol. III. p. 15.

XXVIII.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH of IRELAND.

It is now time to look at that Church in which he have seen the early Irish Presbyterians happily - at least at first, happily - comprehended, the Church of the Establishment, the Episcopal Church of Ireland. In a brief survey we may be enabled to discern the factors which led to an accommodation which operated from the first with so much greater ease than was the case in Scotland and England.

In England Henry VIII. had declared himself "Supreme Head of the Church" - a claim, however, which, when extended to Ireland, meant but little to the vast majority of the Irish people. The nobility, the gentry and clergy of the Pale, together with the commercial classes of the cities, indeed, were no more kindly disposed to the royal supremacy than were the chiefs, the poorer tenants and the clansmen. Attempts to spread the Reformation, a Commission of 1535, the appointment of George Browne as Archbishop of Dublin achieved but little. Legislation, no doubt, was severe enough.

"The Parliament, which met in May, 1537, declared the King supreme Head, on earth, of the Church of Ireland; and interdicted all appeals to Rome. It provided for the payment into the royal treasury of all first fruits, as well of bishoprics, deaneries, and minor ecclesiastical benefices, as of abbeys, priories, and other monastic foundations. The authority of the Bishop of Rome was solemnly renounced; and all maintainers of it made subject to premunire. All officials of every class were required to take the oath of supremacy; and all who refused were declared guilty of high treason."

The dissolution of the Irish monasteries and convents, a Commission of /

of 1539, too, which was directed to search out and destroy relics and images merely inflamed Irish hatred. Of bishops of papal creation who conformed we know only five. Of the inferior clergy, too, few within the Pale, and scarcely any outside it, took the Supremacy Oath. Little progress, also, was made under Edward VI. In February 1551 the Deputy received orders to introduce into Ireland the new Liturgy, which "we . . . have caused . . . to be translated into our mother-tongue of this realm of England." But in vain - indeed, the dignitaries of the Reformed Church themselves showed little enthusiasm. After Mary's death and her reactionary policy Elizabeth in 1560 directed the Irish Parliament to assemble in Dublin and had two important statutes passed. The Act of Supremacy declared her Supreme Governor, as well in ecclesiastical and spiritual matters as in temporal, and denied the papal jurisdiction. That of Uniformity required a certain Reformed Prayer Book to be used everywhere at public worship, and making church attendance compulsory under penalty of a fine. This religious legislation, however, was not strictly enforced - many mayors, for example, as well as Justices of the Peace, never took the Supremacy Oath at all. At the time of Elizabeth's accession twenty-six bishops and four archbishops occupied the Irish Sees - very few of them conforming by taking the Supremacy Oath. Those bishops and priests who refused were generally - though not inevitably - deprived of their sees and livings and either Englishmen or more pliant Irishmen put in their place. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Elizabeth, of course, was not recognised by Rome /

Rome which made its own appointments to vacant sees - fitful appointments, as it turned out, owing to the manifold difficulties and persecutions.

On the whole, then, the Reformation in Ireland was disappointingly slow and unfruitful, a state of affairs for which Reid has given various reasons - the unfavourable state of the kingdom, the inadequacy of the means employed, the harsh proceedings of Parliament, the exclusive use of English agents and of the English language, the general timidity of the Irish Reformers and the want of adequate ministers.² Perhaps, however, we touch the fundamental reason when we note - as has been asserted by a competent historian - that the Reformation in Ireland had not been called for, as in England, by national sentiment, by a revival of learning and by a long growth of opposition to the Papacy - in short, that in Ireland the Reformation had come from above, there being no popular feeling from below to meet it.³

Certainly the picture of the Establishment in the seventeenth century is a sad one - as testified on innumerable hands, Bedell's description, for example, being well known⁴ - as also Wentworth's.⁵ Says Carte too -

"The Church of Ireland was at this time in a deplorable condition, the Cathedrals in many places destroyed, the parish churches generally ruined, unroofed or unrepaired, the houses of the Clergy left desolate, and their possessions alienated during the wars and confusions of former times. Most of the tythes had been appropriated to Monasteries and religious houses, and afterwards vested in the Crown, or sold to private persons and made lay-fees."

Speaking, too, of an earlier period - James I's. day, he says -

than / "Nor were the Parochial Churches in a better condition

than the Cathedral. They had most of them in the country been destroyed in the troubles, or fallen down for want of covering; the livings were very small and either kept in the Bishops hands by way of Commendams and Sequestrations, or else filled with Ministers as scandalous as their income; so that scarce any care was taken to catechise the children, or instruct others in the grounds of religion; and for years together, divine service had not been used in any Parish Church throughout Ulster, except in some city or principal towns." 7

Carte, it seems, had no exalted opinion of the Established clergy -

"And as scandalous livings naturally make scandalous Ministers, the clergy of the established church were generally ignorant and unlearned, loose and irregular in their lives and conversations, negligent of their cures, and very careless of observing uniformity and decency in divine worship, in a Country where they were endangered on one hand by an infinite number of obstinate Recusants, (as almost all the old natives were) and on the other by a shoal of factious and irregular Puritans, brought by Sir Hugh Montgomery and other planters out of Scotland, who kept up their Scottish discipline and way of worship, offered daily insults to the established Church Government, and treated the rites of administering the Sacraments with insufferable contempt." 8

The Bishop of the Isles, too, writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury on July 4, 1611 said -

"Excepting the Lord Chancellor himself, now aged and burdened with the affairs of the whole country, the Archbishop of Tuam, Doctor Challoner, and Mr. Ussher he can name no man of the ministry in this kingdom, who has knowledge or care to propagate the Evangell." 9

Sir Richard Cox is another who bewailed conditions.

"Nor was the Beauty of the Protestant Church sullied by its avowed Enemies only; it was more defaced by its pretended Friends and Members. Things sacred were exposed to sale, in a most sordid and scandalous manner." 10

The Bishop of Derry's information to the Archbishop of Canterbury is equally vexing -

"In the Diocese of Down and Connor I found the resident clergy absolute irregulars, the very ebullition of Scotland, but conformists very rare, and these rather in judgment than practice. It would trouble a man to find twelve common prayer-books /

prayer-books in all their churches, and those only not cast behind the altar, because they have none, but instead of it a table ten yards long, where they sit and receive the sacrament together like good fellows." ¹¹

There is, however, no need to multiply evidence. Little is there to wonder at in the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury -

"I hope the Church of Ireland is not an incurable body, but its own officers countenance abuses." ¹²

The state of affairs was sad, indeed. ¹³ An almost unbelievable laxity and easy-going Laodiceanism prevailed. The comprehension of the Presbyterians accordingly - which would have been remarkable elsewhere - was not altogether surprising here, raising, indeed, little comment. Such a spirit was not entirely absent even in the Roman Catholics. Says Cox in an interesting passage of the "Hibernia Anglicana" -

"Until this time (1604) the Papists generally did come to Church, and were called Church-Papists, but now the Priests began to be seditious, and did not only scandalize the Publick Administration of Affairs, but also took upon them to review and decide some Causes that had been determin'd in the King's Courts, and to oblige their Votaries on pain of Damnation to obey their Decision, and not that of the Law; they did also forbid the People to frequent the Protestant Churches; and they publickly rebuilt Churches for themselves." ¹⁴

The latter part of this paragraph is not surprising but the former definitely is.

Perhaps, however, the most notable feature of the Irish Church in the early seventeenth century was its lack of any constitution. Such attempts, indeed, as had been made to introduce order into the confusion had been by Acts of Parliament, proclamations of the Lord Deputy, meetings of bishops and other such methods. There were /

were, strange to tell, practically no Articles of Belief and no Canons. Hitherto the only articles having any semblance of authority were the eleven articles drawn up by Matthew Parker in 1559 and authorized for Ireland in 1566 - where they were numbered as twelve.¹⁵ Ussher it was, naturally enough, who was deputed to draft a new formulary. This he did most thoroughly, extending it to 104 articles under 19 heads. Incorporating much from the Articles of 1559, and more from the Anglican Articles of 1562, the Irish Articles took over the whole of the Lambeth Articles of 1595 and even went beyond them in exact definition. Convocation, assembled at Dublin, and meeting in 1615 for the first time since the Reformation accepted the Articles, passing a decree that any minister preaching contrary to them should be silenced and deprived. They were not, however, submitted to Parliament; for what reason has not been explained. Yet they were particularist to a degree - teaching absolute predestination and perseverance, denouncing the Pope as Antichrist, inculcating the Puritan view of Sabbath observance (despite the "Book of Sports").¹⁶ Some of the articles, indeed, like that on the Service of God, were rambling and homiletical and quite unsuited for inclusion in such a code. Older writers, accordingly, not to mention the more modern, have been prone to criticize their Calvinistic particularism. "So large a formulary", says Leland, "could not but contain several minute decisions, and even dangerous expositions of what is generally revealed in the Scriptures."¹⁷

From the point of view, however, of our present study the most remarkable /

remarkable feature of all still remains to be noted. "All clergymen", says Collier, "are supposed lawfully called, who have their business assigned them by those who have authority in the Church: but that these authorized persons are none but bishops, is not asserted The consecration of archbishops and bishops is passed over in silence; as if it was done on purpose to avoid asserting the distinction between this order and that of priests."¹⁸ Here, then, we touch the core of the matter. With such a doctrinal outlook the remarkable Irish Accommodation of the early seventeenth century becomes intelligible, the clear understanding between Presbyterians and Episcopalians being easy when such was the theological background. The validity of ordination by presbyters was clearly implied; no authority was claimed for framing and enforcing ecclesiastical canons, or decreeing rites or ceremonies; no allusion made to the mode of consecrating the higher orders of the clergy. Faithful ministers were not compelled to submit to ceremonies to which they objected, and there was to be no unchurching if they found themselves conscientiously unable to approve of all the minute arrangements of government and worship then established in England.

Truly Ireland at that time was the happy home of the accommodationists.

XXVIII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. I.
p. 329.
2. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. pp. 63-70.
3. W.H. Hutton. William Laud. p. 170.
cf. S.R. Gardiner.
"It was the creature of the State as no other Church
in the world was."
History of England. Vol. VIII. p. 53.
4. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. pp. 159 & 160.
5. Strafford. Letters and Dispatches. Vol. I. p. 187 seq.
Spenser's earlier unfavourable account has often been
quoted.
See Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 59 seq.
Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. I.
p. 466 seq.
Also Mountjoy's - Curtis. A History of Ireland. p. 223.
Mant. History of the Church of Ireland. Vol. I. p. 353
seq. for the reports of Visitations. Also p. 389, 395,
403 etc.
6. Carte. History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde.
Vol. I. p. 68.
7. Do. p. 17.
8. Do. p. 68.
9. Calendar of State Papers, Ireland. 1611-1614. p. 81.
10. Cox. Hibernia Anglicana. Part II. p. 53.
11. Calendar of State Papers, Ireland. 1633-1647. pp. 87 & 88.
12. Do. p. 173.
13. cf. Cotton's Fasti Eccles. Hib., with regard to Dr. Richard
Betts -
"When he came to Ireland and learned the poverty of the
see, he declined the preferment, and returned without
consecration." p. 503.
cf. Letter of Sir Robert Cecil to the Earl of Desmond.
"I marvel much that I cannot hear from the Bishop of
Cashell, of whom there is a great scandal bruited, -
that he doth very irreligiously suffer his church to
lie like a hog-sty; where, although it cannot be
denied but the wars have much consumed him, yet it
shall be proved that he hath not suffered such extreme
penury as should so deprive him of all means to live
on."
Calendar of Carew MSS. 1601-1602. Edited Brewer &
Bullen. pp. 12 & 13.
cf. the evidence given in Calendar of State Papers, Ire-
land. 1603-1606. pp. 143, 144, 151, 152, 218, 490,
510 & 531.

- cf. also Calendar of State Papers, Ireland. 1608-1610.
p. 64.
- cf. Calendar of State Papers, Ireland. 1633-1647.
pp. 87, 88 & 132.
- cf. Calendar of State Papers, Ireland. 1647-1660.
And Addenda. 1625-1660. p. 157.
- cf. Ware. Works. Vol. I. p. 118.
14. Cox. Hibernia Anglicana. pp. 9 & 10.
15. Schaff. History of the Creeds of Christendom. p. 662.
- Curtis. History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith.
p. 179.
- Elrington. Ussher's Works. Vol. I. Appendix III.
pp. xxv-xxix.
- Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. I.
p. 395, pp. 515-520.
16. Schaff. History of the Creeds of Christendom. p. 664.
The Articles, however, paved the way for the West-
minster doctrinal standards. Do. p. 665.
- Elrington is puzzled as to how the King accepted such
articles.
"Dr. James Montague, Dean of the Royal Chapel and
successively Bishop of Bath and Wells, and of Win-
chester, 'being a great stickler in the quarrels at
Cambridge, and a great master in the art of insinua-
tion, had cunningly fashioned King James unto certain
Calvinian opinions, to which the King's education in
the Kirk of Scotland had before inclined him. So
that it was no very hard matter for him (having an
Archbishop also of his own persuasion) to make use
of the King's authority for recommending the Nine
Articles to the Church of Ireland, which he found
would not be admitted in the Church of England.'
Another powerful assistant to Archbishop Abbot and
Bishop Montague was no doubt to be found in the Lord
Deputy Chichester, who had been a pupil of the notor-
ious Puritan Cartwright. It might also have been
part of the crooked policy, for which James was re-
markable."
Ussher's Works. Vol. I. pp. 47 & 48.
- cf. Bagwell.
"Ussher's Puritanism was more pronounced in his earlier
days than afterwards, and James was less hostile to
that school than he later became."
Ireland under the Stuarts. Vol. I. p. 228.
17. Leland. History of Ireland. Vol. II. p. 459.
- See also Parr. Life of Ussher. pp. 14 & 15.
- Bernard. Life of Ussher. p. 49.
- Mant. History of the Church of Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 385.
- Elrington. Ussher's Works. Vol. I. p. 44 seq.
- Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 494 seq.
- J.T. Ball. The Reformed Church of Ireland.
p. 114.

Carte says -

"The drawing of it up was left to Dr. Usher, who having not yet got over the tincture he received in his first studies from the modern authority of foreign Divines, inserted in it, not only the Lambeth articles, but also several particular fancies and notions of his own; such as the Sabbatarian doctrine of a Judaical rest on the Lord's day; the particular explication of what is in Scripture revealed only in general, concerning the generation of the Son, which Calvin had taken upon him to determine was not from the Essence, but from the Person of the Father; the sacerdotal power of absolution made declarative only; abstinences from flesh upon certain days appointed by authority, declared not to be religious fasts, but to be grounded merely upon politick views and considerations; and the Pope made to be Antichrist, according to the like determination of the French Huguenots in one of their synods at Gappe in Dauphine, though the characters and description of Antichrist agree, in all points, to no body but the impostor Mahomet. These conceptions of his were incorporated into the articles of the Church of Ireland, and by his credit approved in Convocation, and afterwards confirmed by the Lord Deputy Chichester. Several of these gave great offence to the Roman Catholics, and hindered their conversion; and others of them gave as much encouragement to the Puritans brought out of Scotland into Ulster; and both made their advantage of them to the prejudice of the Church of Ireland."

History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde.

Vol. I. pp. 77 & 78.

The Calvinism of the Irish Church was largely due to the fact that so many of the English Puritans had been preferred to benefices or dignities in Ireland - e.g. Travers had been made Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.

18. Collier. Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.

Vol. VII. p. 384.

Speaking of the independence of the Irish Church Mant says -

"There were at this time some of the clergy of the Irish Church who were ambitious of establishing an independent character; of framing articles of religion of their own, and by their own authority, and so of distinguishing themselves and their successors by their own peculiar character as a free national church."

History. Vol. I. p. 383.

XXIX.

WENTWORTH.

With the passing of the years the spirit of accommodation became more and more difficult and the forces arrayed against it less and less easy to combat. Indeed, the first quarter of the seventeenth century came to be regarded by the advocates of comprehension as almost an ideal age. Into the limelight, however, came Lord Deputy Wentworth as the real driving force from 1632 to 1638, the reorganizing of the Protestant Church in Ireland being with him an overruling passion.

Already we have had occasion to allude to his description of the sad state of the church. Here - as in the realm of the state - his policy was "Thorough". In December 1633, indeed, he issued commissions all over Ireland for the repair of the church buildings. Yeoman service, too, he did in putting a stop to the evil traffic in ecclesiastical properties,¹ in fighting, also, the scandals arising out of private advowsons,² as well as of non-residence.³ Naturally, such a man was at once highly respected and bitterly hated. "The Viceroy", wrote the Bishop of Ferns, "is a stern man, and desirous of maintaining peace amongst us, not through any affection which he bears ourselves, but because the laity are always more or less agitated by our dissensions."⁴ Reid, in his History, does not regard him as in any way favourable to the Presbyterians.

"A more unfortunate choice of a deputy could not have been made for the Presbyterians of Ireland, and, perhaps, it /

it might be added, for the nation at large, the subsequent calamities of which may, in a great measure, be attributed to the elevation of this most talented but unconstitutional statesman. Haughty and overbearing in his manner, irascible and vindictive in his temper, tyrannical in his political, and intolerant in his religious sentiments, it was in vain to look to him for either protection against illegal oppression, or relief from prelatical severities. Viewing man as born either to rule or to obey, he was incapable of sympathising with those who suffered for any principle of conscience; and entrusted with the care of assimilating the ecclesiastical state of Ireland to that of England, he was especially hostile to every species of nonconformity."

This last sentence, indeed, gives us the key to his policy. He and Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, wished to terminate the differences between the Churches of England and Ireland in respect of the Articles which formed the standard of doctrine in each, and to effect an absolute uniformity between them.^b "The point he (Bramhall) proposed", says Ware, "(which was an Union between the Churches of England and Ireland, in the same Articles of Religion, and the same Canons of Discipline and Worship) he managed with great Address. The two Churches had much of the same Air and Spirit, but differed in some Articles, which were looked upon as inclining to Calvinism. Our Bishop laboured in the Convocation to have the Correspondence between the two Churches more intimate, and the Articles of Communion expressed in that Latitude, that dissenting Persons, in Matters not of pure Faith, might subscribe; that the two Churches, being reformed by the same Principle and Rule of Scripture, might confess their Faith in the same Form."^c

Wentworth's correspondence with Laud on the question makes interesting reading. He writes -

"It is true, my Lord Primate seemed to disallow these Articles of Ireland, but when it comes to the Upshot, I cannot /

cannot find he doth it so absolutely as I expected: Some little Trouble there hath been in it, and we are all bound not to advertise it over, hoping amongst ourselves to reconcile it. But this I will promise your Lordship, that unless I can carry it so as to have the Articles of England received in ipsissimis Verbis, leaving the other as no ways concerned in the State they now are either affirmed or disaffirmed, you shall hear from me roundly, and have the whole Matter, wherein for the present none suffer so much as my Lord of Derry in the Upper, and Mr. Croxton in the Lower House of Convocation. I beseech you let me know if I be not in the right."

Laud, of course, was delighted.

"I knew how you would find my Lord Primate affected to the Articles of Ireland; but I am glad the Trouble that hath been in it will end there without advertising of it over to us. And whereas you propose to have the Articles of England received in ipsissimis verbis, and leave the other as no way concerned, neither affirmed nor denied, you are certainly in the Right, and so says the King (to whom I imparted it) as well as I; go, hold close and you will do a great Service in it."

So Wentworth had his way with the Articles - as also with the hundred canons. How, indeed, he carried through his purpose with an arbitrary and high hand is a well-known and oft-narrated story which does not require to be detailed here.

"So as now I can say the King is as absolute here, as any Prince in the whole world can be, and may be still if it be not spoiled on that Side. For so long as his Majesty shall have here a Deputy of Faith and Understanding, and that he be preserved in Credit and independent upon any but the King himself, let it be laid as a ground, it is the Deputy's Fault, if the King be denied any reasonable Desire."

Such was his proud boast.

The forcing of the Thirty-Nine Articles on Convocation, needless to say, was sorely against Ussher's will. And little wonder. The first canon, sanctioning the Thirty-Nine Articles said -

"We do receive and approve the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops and the

the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion. And therefore, if any hereafter shall affirm that any of those Articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated, and not absolved before he make a public revocation of his error." ¹²

Said another -

"Whosoever shall separate themselves from the communion of saints, as it is approved by the Apostles' rules in the Church of Ireland, and combine themselves together in a new brotherhood - accounting the Christians who are conformable to the doctrine, government, rites, and ceremonies of the Church of Ireland to be profane and unmeet for them to join with in Christian profession - or shall affirm and maintain that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches, let him be excommunicated, and not restored until he repent and publicly revoke his error." ¹³

Here were shrewd blows to the traditional Irish church spirit of accommodation. And futile is it to regard Ussher's opposition as mere pique because his own child - the 1615 Confession was being slighted. ¹⁴ Patriotic sentiment alone supported Ussher in resisting the encroachment of England ¹⁵ - a popular cry. "The Canons", wrote Sir George Radcliffe to the Bishop of Derry, "are published in print this week; and by occasion of speaking thereof, here is a panic fear risen in this town, as if a new persecution (so they call it) were instantly to be set on foot." ¹⁶

Nor did Ussher oppose merely on the score that he preferred the strong anti-Roman bias of the Irish Articles. ¹⁷ A potent reason, undoubtedly, was the sorrow with which he saw the comprehensive basis of the church being undermined - an evolution entirely against his convictions. No doubt he succeeded in resisting /

resisting the revocation altogether of the Irish Articles, candidates for Orders henceforth being required to sign both series of Articles - surely a lengthy test of orthodoxy. There were, however, serious differences between the two - as on the subject of predestination and the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence of Christ. Their co-existing, accordingly, the one with an affirmation of Calvinistic theories and the other with an evasion of them was anything but reasonable.¹⁸ Yet Ussher adhered to his Irish Articles in a desperate effort to retain something, at least, of his accommodation ideals. They continued nominally in force, but, as a matter of fact, quietly passed out of use during the disorder of the rebellion of 1641.

Accommodation had suffered a reverse - a vexing set-back, indeed, to the Primate, the more so as he felt assured of an influential backing. Chappel, Bishop of Cork and Ross, for example, was keen to compose the religious animosities of the time, though vehemently opposed, he says, "both by Rome and Geneva".¹⁹ Nor was he alone.

XXIX. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Strafford. Letters. Vol. I. p. 299.
2. Do. p. 188.
3. Do. Vol. II. p. 7.
4. Spicilegium Ossoriense. p. 199.
5. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 142.
6. cf. Leland.
"The great point for which the king, archbishop Laud, and the lord deputy were equally zealous, still remained to be effected; the complete union of the churches of England and Ireland, by establishing the English articles and canons in this latter kingdom, as the rule of doctrine and discipline. The clergy of the puritanic cast were by no means favourers of such an attempt, and affected a zealous solicitude for what they called the independence of this church. Usher, the head of this party, had never been regarded by lord Wentworth with a favourable eye; but, on account of his station, character, and popularity, was to be treated with respect and caution."
History of Ireland. Vol. II. pp. 27 & 28.
cf. Letter of Bramhall to the Bishop of London. Aug. 10, 1633.
"But the clergy are not orthodox, and I wish very much the English faith were established here by Act of Parliament; that, as we are under one Sovereign, so we might be uniform in faith."
Calendar of State Papers, Ireland. James I. 1633-1647.
p. 17.
Mant describes the dependence of the Church of Ireland on the Church of England in Vol. I., p. 382.
7. Sir James Ware. Vol. I. p. 120.
8. Strafford. Letters. Vol. I. p. 298.
9. Do. p. 329.
10. Do. p. 342 seq.
Cox. Hibernia Anglicana. Part II. p. 55.
11. Strafford. Letters. Vol. I. p. 344.
12. Canon I.
13. Canon V.
The most important of the Irish Canons concerned the use of the Irish language in Church during divine service, where all, or most, of the people were Irish. One of them provided that, in case the minister were English, the parish clerk should be chosen to read those portions of the service as were appointed to be read in the Irish language - a wise provision.
14. Carte. Life of Ormonde. p. 78.
15. Ware. Works. Vol. I. p. 108.
16. Rawdon Papers. pp. 22 & 23.
cf. W.J. Sparrow Simpson. Bramhall. p. 44.
17. /

17. W.J. Sparrow Simpson.
 "What made the Calvinistic articles more congenial to the Irish Church was evidently the controversial desire to be as Anti-Roman as was possible. They dissociated themselves as far as they could, in self-defence, from the Roman Catholics, and indulged affinities with the extremer type of continental Protestantism."
 Bramhall. p. 46.
18. W.J. Sparrow Simpson. Bramhall. pp. 36 & 43.
19. Cotton. Fasti Eccles. Hib. Vol. I. p. 226.

THE CROMWELLIAN PERIOD and the ASSOCIATIONS.

It does not fall within our province to detail the history of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland or yet of the Episcopal Church of Ireland - only to dwell on those factors which have a relation to accommodation movements between them.

The terrible rebellion of 1641, be it said, had its effects on both. The Established Church was practically swept out of existence.¹ Many of her clergy were brutally murdered² and of those who were living when peace was partially restored, only a few and not one of the prelates remained in the province. Public service according to the Episcopal^{AN} ritual almost ceased, and in all those parts of the kingdom where the Irish displaced the English power, the prelates of the Establishment were ejected from their sees,³ and their palaces and revenues appropriated by Romish bishops.⁴ On the other hand, as a body, the Presbyterians suffered less by the ravages of the rebellion than any other class.⁵ Indeed, it was a strange transformation that took place. For about the first thirty years in her history, as we have seen, the Presbyterian Church had formed a part of the Establishment, afterwards, during Wentworth's administration, being almost extinguished. Now, however, she was so strengthened and encouraged that she could assume a distinctly separate existence as the Protestant Church in Ulster, indeed, until the Restoration being virtually the Established Church of the Province. Her ministers conducted services /

services in the parish churches and received the parochial tithes. The rebellion, strangely enough, had been the means indirectly of strengthening the Presbyterians. Most of the regiments that composed the Scottish army that had been sent over for the relief of Ireland were accompanied by chaplains. These proceeded, with the consent of the General and the several Colonels, to select from among the officers godly men of intelligence to act as ruling elders in each of the regiments to which they were attached.

"The first Presbytery was held at Carrickfergus on the 10th of June, 1642, where were only five ministers of the army and four ruling elders from the four regiments, who had then erected sessions - viz. Argyle's, Eglinton's, Glencairn's, and Hume's. One of their number (Mr. Baird) preached, by desire of the rest, and by appointment beforehand, on Psalm li. and last; another was chosen Moderator; and Mr. Thomas Peebles was chosen Clerk, in which office he remained during his life.

They began with appointing divers of their members to speak to the Colonels and Lieutenant-Colonels of those regiments, where there were not sessions, together with the rest of the officers and others concerned in the regiments, that sessions might be erected. Withal, they appointed each minister to begin examination in his charge; and appointed, also, a fast to be observed the week after, and to be intimated next Sabbath - wherein they were to sympathise with the case of the churches abroad in Germany and Bohemia; the present distraction of England and hazard of God's work there at that time, through the difference beginning between the King and Parliament; and the people of this poor land, who were scarce as brands plucked out of the fire, yet security and profanity remaining among many both in country and army - and that God should be cried unto to bless the country with a spiritual ministry, and for a blessing to the going out of the army against the Irish, &c. All these were immediately performed, and so the Presbytery did meet almost weekly, though few in number. There were, besides these ministers of the Scotch army, two preachers in the country before, Mr. John Drysdale, and Mr. James Baty, and one preached to Lord Claneboy's, the other to the Lord of Ard's regiment."

So run Adair's historic words. The organization thus inaugurated was quickly extended, seven congregations composing a Presbytery of /

of Antrim, eight a Presbytery of Down. In response, also, to an Irish petition for assistance, the Scottish General Assembly, in the autumn of 1642 sent six deputies to aid in the development of the Presbyterian Church. Reid describes not only their success but also a consequent movement, accommodation-like in its evolution.

"Many of the episcopal clergy, however, now came forward and joined the Presbytery. They were received into communion, but not until they professed repentance for their former courses: some, for taking the black oath; others, for having imposed it upon the people; some, for having been persecutors of the nonconformists; and all for having departed from scriptural truth by their submission to prelacy. These confessions and acknowledgments they made in public; a few before the Presbytery, and others before their respective parishes, in presence of some of the brethren. They were then received as preachers of the Gospel, but they were not recognised as members of the Presbytery until they had been regularly called and ordained to the charge of congregations. Divers ministers and others who had taken the black oath, and been instrumental in ensnaring others in it, and had gone on in a course of conformity and defection, upon an intimation from the Presbytery, did come and own their sinful defection, and made the same acknowledgments in those places where they had been particularly scandalous; as Mr. Nevin, at Donaghadee, &c., &c. Divers of them gave satisfaction, some before Mr. Blair in Bangor, Donaghadee, and Killileagh; and others before Mr. Hamilton. In this the hand of the Lord is to be observed, that these men, who, a few years before, were deposed and driven out of the country for refusing conformity, shall be the first who shall receive the acknowledgments and repentance of Conformists."

No doubt this was more in the nature of an absorption than an accommodation yet the willingness of the Episcopalians to take part in it is at least suggestive.

A further impetus, undoubtedly, came from the Solemn League and Covenant adopted by England and Scotland in 1643, Presbyterianism, indeed, becoming, in consequence, the national religion of Great Britain. The ascendancy, of course, outside of Scotland -
as /

as we have already seen - was artificial but lasted sufficiently long to strengthen the Presbyterian Church of Ireland. Subsequently, with the joint sanction of the English and Scottish Parliaments, commissioners of the General Assembly were despatched to Ulster from Scotland to administer the Covenant.

"The covenant was taken in all places with great affection; partly with sorrow for former judgments and sins and miseries; partly with joy under present consolation, in the hopes of laying a foundation for the work of God in the land, and overthrowing Popery and prelacy, which had been the bane and ruin of that poor church. Sighs and tears were joined together, and it is much to be observed, both the way ministers used toward the people for clearing their consciences in order to the covenant, in explaining it before they proposed it to the people, and from Scripture and solid consequences from it, clearing every article of it - and thereafter offered it only to those whose consciences stirred them up to it."

So Adair describes it. The tolerant way in which it was administered - we may add - compares favourably with what we have already seen as existing in Scotland. Indeed, not a few of the Episcopalians themselves became Covenanters.¹⁰ The adaptable - and indeed fluid - ecclesiastical environment, we see, continues as a remarkable and characteristic feature of Ireland. Macaulay, in a notable passage, referred to this. He is speaking of the Establishment and says -

"Yet this monstrous institution was much less disliked by the Puritans settled in Ireland than the Church of England by the English sectaries. For in Ireland religious divisions were subordinate to national divisions; and the Presbyterian, while, as a theologian, he could not but condemn the established hierarchy, yet looked on that hierarchy with a sort of complacency when he considered it as a sumptuous and ostentatious trophy of the victory achieved by the great race from which he sprang." (History. Vol. I. p. 393).

Moreover, we know it was carried over into the Commonwealth.

In a sense the issue was not so involved as in England, there not being so many strange and heterogeneous sects. "The enemy in this kingdom", wrote the Marquis of Clanricarde in 1651, "are (in a manner) equally divided into two parties, the Presbyterian and the old Protestant makes the one, the other are the Independents of whom Ireton is the head, and Broghill and Coote of the former; the hatred between them is known to be so great and irreconcilable, that with good reasons it may be daily expected they will break into war and confusion." "

Yet, after the initial period, it became obvious that there was to be a broad toleration. The utter destruction of Episcopacy and of set forms of worship, no doubt, was the intention. As time wore on, however, a remarkable latitude became apparent. Provided a man was well-disposed towards the Parliament and could produce satisfactory testimonials of life and ability, did not use the Prayer Book, the surplice or the sign of the cross in baptism, he was, "ceteris paribus", accepted as a "minister of the gospel" whatever his denomination might be. Recruited the candidates were from England and Ireland, while some came from as far afield as New England. Altogether some 376 persons were paid by the State as "ministers of the gospel" and of these at least 65 were clergy of the Irish Episcopal Church. The majority, doubtless, were Independents, a few Anabaptists and about 67 Presbyterians. In addition were unpaid clergy of the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches.¹² Ecclesiastical divisions, of course, like dioceses, were ignored - the ministers at first were placed in towns though afterwards, too, in /

in rural districts. Towards the close of the Commonwealth, indeed, an attempt actually was made to restore the parochial system. These "ministers of the gospel" were appointed in different ways, from 1645 onwards by a body reminiscent of the English "Triers" - more tolerant, however, than their English counterparts.

Such, then, was the rough-and-ready Cromwellian accommodation, like Leighton's, thoroughly Erastian.¹³ So long as the strong arm of compulsion was in the background it worked none too badly. Plainly, however, it had no stable foundation and was unlikely to last so soon as that arm was removed.¹⁴

And now we come to the "Associations" - the Irish form of Baxter's Voluntary Associations which we studied in connection with the accommodation movements of England - typical of the Commonwealth period they were in Ireland as well as in England.

On February 22, 1658 it was that the ministers of the city of Dublin and province of Leinster agreed to join together "in order to their entering into and walking together in a brotherly association for the furthering of a real and thorough reformation of persons, families, and congregations in all matters of religion." A rare little book printed in Dublin in 1659 gives on the title page the purpose and scope of the Association - "Such reforming churches as consist of persons sound in the faith, and of conversation becoming the Gospel, ought not to despise the union of each other, so far as may consist with their own principles respectively, though they walk not in all things according to the same rules of Church order." An accommodation it was to embrace Presbyterians /

Presbyterians, Independents and such Episcopalians as had become "ministers of the gospel". In church government three orders were allowed - (1) Pastors and Teachers: to preach the Gospel, to teach and exhort, and to administer the seals of the Covenant. (2) Ruling Elders: to join with the Pastors in governing the Church. (3) Deacons: to receive the Church treasury, and therewith to serve tables, and particularly to relieve the poor. In the conduct of Divine Service the Directory was to be the guide. Insistence was to be made in infant baptism. Use was to be made of the Westminster Longer and Shorter Catechisms, as well as the Confession. At their first general meeting they resolved to elect a Moderator as well as a Registrar to enter up the minutes of the proceedings. They were to receive as members all brethren within the city and province who were duly called to the ministry by ordination, and were sound in the faith. All that should be ordained presbyters by the Association for charges in the province should be received as members. The right was reserved to admit any orthodox godly brother who should declare his intention of being regularly ordained.

An Association of ministers in Co. Cork had been formed as early as 1656,¹⁵ many of its members being Low Church clergy. Its purpose is known through its book published in 1657 - "The Agreement and Resolution of Severall Associated Ministers in the County of Cork For the Ordaining of ministers." It appeared anonymously, but on the title page of the copy in the National Library, Dublin, there is written in a contemporary hand (after 1660) the words "By Worth Bp."

The first pages are devoted to the general question of the distinction of the ministerial office and of the necessity of ordination.

As between the Association in Leinster and the Association in Cork there were apparent differences. The object of the former was to provide a common theological basis on which ministers of different denominations might meet and agree, each party being left free to follow its own system of church discipline and organization - a real effort, surely, at accommodation. The Cork Association was entirely interested in ordination - ordination by presbyters who had received their orders through Episcopacy or Presbyterianism.

These Associations were set up in various parts of Ireland and greatly helped the cause of accommodation in the Cromwellian period. In both Ireland and England, indeed, they were the distinctive contribution of the Commonwealth - in both, however, they were features which eventually passed away.

XXX. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. "Many waves had gone over the Protestant Episcopal Church. Between Catholic rebels and Puritan conquerors it had been swept out of existence as an ecclesiastical organisation. The lands of bishops and chapters had been confiscated by the government; tithes had been sequestrated and were now paid into the treasury. More than half the sees were vacant through the death of their occupants."
C.H. Firth. The Last Years of the Protectorate.
Vol. II. pp. 148 & 149.
2. Mant. History of the Church of Ireland. Vol. I.
p. 561 seq.
3. Do. p. 563 seq.
4. Do. p. 570.
5. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 341.
6. Adair. Narrative. pp. 93 & 94.
Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 372 seq.
Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. II.
p. 53.
Latimer. History of the Irish Presbyterians. p. 86.
7. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 379.
8. Do. pp. 386 & 387.
9. Adair. Narrative. pp. 103 & 104.
Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 437.
10. Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. II.
p. 55.
Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. I. p. 451.
Mant's description is very different. According to his account the Solemn League and Covenant was administered "with the utmost violence by the Scotch ministers."
History of the Church of Ireland. Vol. I. p. 581.
11. Calendar of the MSS. of the Marquis of Ormonde. New Series. Vol. I. 1902. p. 239.
12. cf. Latimer. "Towards the end of the Commonwealth period there seemed to be a tendency to place all the ministers on tithes."
A History of the Irish Presbyterians. p. 119.
13. Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. II.
p. 123.
14. "The religious Establishment which he set up in Ireland must have fallen, sooner or later, under the weight of its own contradictions. He had a noble opportunity of commending the Gospel to the people of this island, and of exhibiting its holy and genial influence /

influence as compared with the tyranny and superstitions of the priesthood; but he was known to them as a man of blood, as a canting hypocrite, and as a heartless spoiler."

Killen. Vol. II. p. 127.

"The brevity of the Cromwellian regime, however, prevented the full success of the great scheme for turning Ireland into a second England."

Curtis. A History of Ireland. p. 254.

15.

Thurloe. V. p. 353.

Irwin. History of Presbyterianism in Dublin. p. 5.

THE RESTORATION and the REVOLUTION.

We now come to the period of the Restoration of Charles II. only, however, to discover a most remarkable difference from the corresponding period in England and Scotland. In these lands - as we have seen - the Restoration ushered in the great age of the accommodations, accommodations which were intensified right up to the Revolution. In Ireland, on the other hand, it was entirely otherwise. There a distinctive feature existed - an initial accommodation which gradually disintegrated until the division became permanent and unhealable. Alas, the great (name of) Ussher had passed away - he died in 1656 - and there was no one who could quite take his place. A school of accommodationists, no doubt, continued to exist - we shall make some study of a few of them. The adverse forces, however, were too strong so that never again was there that comprehensive atmosphere as obtained say, between the beginning of the century and the time of the Confession of 1634.

The ecclesiastical position just previous to the Restoration, we know, was anomalous - Cromwell's Establishment being hardly a Church at all, not having courts, assemblies, laws or ordinances. Rather was it a loose association of churches based on the Congregational principle of the autonomy of the local church under the headship of Christ. The Episcopal Church of Ireland, assuredly, had not been disestablished - it had merely fallen into abeyance. /

abeyance. Vacant bishoprics had not been filled up, the congregational system had superseded the parochial, "meeting-houses" took the place of the churches - "ministers of the gospel" being Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists and Episcopalians alike - a curious Cromwellian accommodation, if we may so term it. The situation, however, was sufficiently fluid to make men wonder what the future organization would be, the accommodationists, with the rest, having their hopes. The Presbyterians, we know, had taken no small part to bring the Restoration about,¹ and had actually offered an address of congratulation to Charles.² Says Adair -

"When the brethren had access to his Majesty, he was pleased to hear the address, as then framed, read by Mr. Annesley. He looked with an awful, majestic countenance on them; yet he gave them good words, owning the ministers of Ireland's loyalty in the time of the usurpers, and promising his Royal protection for the time to come. He bid them not fear, for he had appointed a Deputy for Ireland, who would prove their friend (this was the Lord Roberts, though another was appointed afterwards); and concluded by promising to give Lord Roberts his commands concerning them."³

Surely they could expect much of one who had taken the Covenant. The Roman Catholics, too, had their hopes. "What amount of toleration Catholic and Protestant dissenters would get", says Curtis, "was the question. Ormond's policy aimed at balancing them against one another so as to keep the Episcopalian ascendancy safe."⁴ And in this he was successful, the Episcopalian victory being complete. Charles, ever lavish in promises and wishing to please everybody was likely, however, to please nobody.⁵ Three months after he was proclaimed King, he proceeded to reestablish Protestant Episcopacy in Ireland. Eight Irish bishops had survived /

survived the Commonwealth. They were John Bramhall (Derry), Henry Jones (Clogher), Henry Leslie (Down), John Leslie (Raphoe), Robert Maxwell (Kilmore), Griffith Williams (Ossory), Thomas Fulwar (Ardfert), and William Baylie (Clonfert). Exile had been the lot of some of these, some, too, were pliant enough - Jones, for example, having been Scoutmaster-General to Cromwell. On January 27, 1661 two archbishops and ten bishops were consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral. The archbishops were the gentle James Margetson (Dublin) and Samuel Pullen (Tuam). The bishops were Michael Boyle (Cork and Ross), John Parker (Elphin), Robert Price (Ferns and Leighlin), Henry Hall (Killala), George Baker (Waterford and Lismore), Edward Synge (Limerick), Edward Worth (Killaloe), Robert Leslie (Raphoe), George Wilde (Derry), and Jeremy Taylor (Down and Connor). All were of British birth or parentage, three having been educated at Oxford, three at Cambridge, and six at Trinity College, Dublin.

On the whole the list did not augur too well for accommodation. Price was noted for his indolence,⁶ Boyle was an appropriator of incomes.⁷ Says Killen -

"Among the prelates who flourished immediately after the Restoration, there were none at all to be compared to Bedell or Ussher. In the selection of the new dignitaries, political services or family connections had generally more influence than piety or learning. Instead of devoting themselves to the spiritual duties of their office, and thus seeking to remove the odium which had so long rested on their order, most of the bishops still continued to give offence by their covetousness, secularity, and ambition."⁸

From the point of view of our subject - the study of accommodations - undoubtedly the two most important are Bramhall and Taylor, /

Taylor, to whom, however, we shall devote separate chapters and so need not speak of them here. Margetson, a patient sufferer under persecution, who had refused to use the Directory instead of the Prayer-Book, who had fled and been imprisoned, who was successively Archbishop of Dublin (1661-3) and Archbishop of Armagh (1663-78), however, is worthy of note. A Christian gentleman, he softened down the bitterness of the ministers to Jeremy Taylor. In 1666 his policy of conciliation suffered a set-back through the discovery of the so-called Presbyterian plot.⁹

Edward Worth, too, should be noted. Formerly Dean of Cork and subsequently Bishop of Killaloe he had been Presbyterian in his sympathies.¹⁰

Despite all this, however, no accommodation materialised. Instead, a period of persecution ensued. The restored bishops procured the passage through parliament of a second Act of Conformity of the most stringent character, requiring every clergyman not only to profess in the presence of his congregation the fullest acceptance of the Prayer-Book, but also to subscribe a declaration that the subject, under no pretence whatever, might bear arms against the King, and that the Solemn League and Covenant was illegal and impious. For all this, however, few conformed and many were the ejections." Undoubtedly, as a result, the establishment was much weakened. The Government, on the other hand, finding that coercion was of little avail, showed a more tolerant spirit. They restrained the Bishops' Courts from the odious practice of imposing heavy fines upon absentees from public worship, and released, from time /

time to time, the ministers who had been imprisoned, some of them for the long term of six years.¹² It was now known that the Presbyterians were not responsible for the Blood Plot and that the King was not altogether forgetful of the services of the Presbyterians to himself as well as to his father. One can discern a change of heart in a letter, dated May 5, 1677, of Lord Chancellor Boyle to Ormond -

"Perhaps it may not be amiss for your Grace to know His Majesty's pleasure as to the Presbyterians in the North, and likewise as to the conventicles in this City; that they in the North are a numerous rabble is very well known to your Grace, and that they will never want discontented factionists to enflame them upon all overtures of trouble cannot be much doubted while they are so near in neighbourhood to Scotland, and that the most violent and most discontented of that kingdom have the freedom of coming over hither when they please and without being taken notice of; and that they have a settled Presbytery in the Lagan is very certain, but whether a more rough proceeding with them than is already exercised, or the hopes of overcoming them by a compliance and an easy hand is a subject too tedious to be debated by a letter."¹³

"Hopes of overcoming them by a compliance and an easy hand" - a new note was this.¹⁴

And so, summing up - in the second half of Charles' reign freedom of public worship was largely enjoyed in Ireland, the Presbyterians forming no exception. There could still be, of course - and were - outbursts of violence as, for example, that of Bishop Boyle.¹⁵

Charles II. died in 1685 and was succeeded by James II., his brother. The new King, an avowed Roman Catholic, had small interest in any accommodation of Episcopalians and Presbyterians. He need not, accordingly, command much of our attention - nor yet his process of completely Romanizing Ireland.¹⁶ His conciliatory measures /

measures had as their ultimate object not the benefit of Presbyterians or Episcopalians but of Roman Catholics. In 1687 he published his "Declaration for Liberty of Conscience", suspending by virtue of his royal authority the execution of all the penal laws that had been framed to enforce conformity to the national Church, and prohibiting the imposing of religious tests as qualifications for office. Undoubtedly the step - albeit unconstitutional - brought relief to the Presbyterians. The Act of Toleration, too, was no more sincere - a Bill of Attainder involving numerous Protestants by name in the penalties of high treason. As a result Episcopalians and Presbyterians were drawn together. Says Reid -

"In this hour of peril, the Presbyterians generously forgot their past sufferings from the Episcopalians, and cordially joined with their recent persecutors in opposing the rising ascendancy of the Romanists, which, being based upon the most wanton exercise of arbitrary power, and accompanied with the most provoking insults to their common faith, was equally alarming to both."

Such a communion was highly beneficial. With the advent of William of Orange, indeed, on the scene - a stout friend of comprehension - all seemed to augur well for the accommodationists. A Presbyterian and a strong Calvinist, predestination was the keystone of his religion; ¹⁸ a Protestant, too, he was yet no bigot. As we have seen, he did his best to have such changes effected in the polity and ritual of the Church of England that nonconformists might be included in the pale. In Scotland, also, thanks to him, Presbyterianism was effectively established on the basis of the "Revolution Settlement" - in England and Ireland,

on /

on the other hand, Episcopal narrowness successfully frustrated his favourite project.

Certainly William did all he could. In England, as a matter of fact, the worship of the nonconformist was legalized, but he himself could hold no office under the crown unless he qualified for it by communicating in his parish church. In Ireland, the case was reversed. The nonconformist was eligible for all public offices, but his worship was prohibited under penalties, the severity of which may be learned from the fact that every Presbyterian minister who dared to dispense the Lord's Supper rendered himself liable to a fine of one hundred pounds. It was the desire of William that all such disabilities should be abolished, that the utmost freedom of worship should be allowed, and that all his Protestant subjects alike should be at full liberty to serve their King and country. But, being a constitutional monarch, and obliged to govern in accordance with law, his wishes were often disregarded.¹⁹ The King was frustrated at every turn, the bishops of the Established Church being bent on the extinguishing of nonconformity. As, too, they were supreme in the House of Lords and commanded a majority in the House of Commons, no headway could be made.²⁰ The idea of passing a Toleration Bill for Ireland was strongly favoured by Lord Lieutenant Capel. Joseph Boyse of Dublin, indeed, had published a pamphlet entitled "The Case of the Protestant Dissenters in Ireland, in reference to a Bill of Indulgence, represented and argued" in which he showed that such a Bill, reasonable in itself, was necessary for the common Protestant /

Protestant interest.²¹ To this two of the bishops issued replies. Dr. Tobias Pullen argued that toleration would multiply sects, encourage the Romanists, and prevent Episcopalians having it "in their power to show their tenderness to their dissenting brethren." Dr. Anthony Dopping, Bishop of Meath, thought no toleration ought to be granted to Presbyterians unless accompanied by a Sacramental Test, by which they would be excluded from public offices.²² In the Irish Parliament opened on August 27, 1695 the measure was from the first doomed.²³ The hopes of the accommodationists were fast fading. One heartening feature, however, in the prevailing gloom was the revival of the Association idea. On July 15, 1696 a union was formed between the Presbyterian and Independent Congregations of Munster and Leinster - from which union arose the Presbytery of Munster. That Presbytery, joining with some ministers in the Dublin area, constituted the Southern Association²⁴ - a step in the evolution of accommodation.

And now, we may fittingly conclude this chapter with some brief notes of the principal Irish prelates of the later seventeenth century and their respective attitudes towards any form of comprehension.

Narcissus Marsh, in many ways an exemplary archbishop successively of Cashel, Dublin and Armagh, had, significantly enough, an interest in Stillingfleet, actually purchasing his library for St. Sepulchre's.²⁵ Nathaniel Foy, Bishop of Waterford, a hard-working servant of the Church, had certainly the courage of his convictions. Bishop William Moreton of Kildare, too, pursued at least /

least the path of accommodation with the Roman Catholics, advising their leaders to ask the priests to submit to the authority of William III. and even suggesting payment of their bishops. Bishop Edward Worth of Killaloe was Presbyterian in his sympathies²⁷ as assuredly Anthony Dopping, Bishop of Meath, was not. Of the evangelical Bishop Edward Wetenhall of Kilmore Killen does not speak very favourably.²⁸ There was, however, another side to his character as is plain from Anthony Wood. He details some of his works including the following -

"The Protestant Peace-maker: or, a seasonable Persuasive to all serious Christians, who call themselves Protestants, that, laying aside Calumnies and all exasperating Disputes, they would pursue Charity, Peace and Union, as the only means now left us of Safety and Reformation of the public Manners. Lond. 1682.

In the said book, being several things spoken in favour of dissenters, one Edward Pearse, minister of Cottesbrook in Northamptonshire, a zealous conforming nonconformist, saith there of the author and his work, - "The honourable ambassador of peace speaks home, and from his heart, and shall for ever set high in the esteem of all the sons of peace."²⁹

It is obvious then, that the name of Wetenhall cannot well be omitted from our study.

Some names - such as these - were not altogether unfavourable to the growth of a comprehensive atmosphere. Nevertheless, that atmosphere did not take shape, a fact which is largely due to the adverse influence of Archbishop William King who could in no wise stomach the Presbyterians. Famous for his "State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's Government (1691), which provided a powerful vindication of the principles of the Revolution,³⁰ he was the author also of "A Discourse concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God." (1694).

"This /

"This clever and plausible performance is written in a spirit of affected friendship for Presbyterians; and being free from unseemly bitterness, and harsh or irritating epithets, it was calculated to make a deeper impression on the minds of its readers than was likely to result from its arguments alone. It has been highly commended by Episcopalian writers, as much for its candour and fairness, as for its strength of reasoning. Yet it is, in reality, a very disingenuous and offensive work, refuting puerile objections disowned by Presbyterians, while it is full of unworthy insinuations and unfounded charges."

So Reid describes it.³¹ All the same, King denied that he wished to stir up old animosities, and declared himself solely anxious to remove the objections of those who refused to attend the established church.³² That, doubtless, was a step in the right direction. To accommodation, however, he had no contribution to make. On the contrary, his powerful influence was largely responsible for its failure.

XXXI. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. II. p. 240.
2. Reid. Vol. II. p. 249.
3. Adair. True Narrative. p. 243.
4. Curtis. A History of Ireland. p. 259.
5. "In the fulness of his joy at finding himself safely seated on the throne of his fathers Charles II. had expressed his desire to make his people as truly happy as he himself was. So far as Ireland was concerned, it was soon apparent that the attempt to make all happy was likely to end in gratifying nobody."
Cambridge Modern History. Vol. V. ch. X.
The Revolution and the Revolution Settlement in Great Britain. (3) Ireland from the Restoration to the Act of Resumption. (1660-1700). p. 301.
6. Ware. Works. Vol. I. p. 393.
7. Do. p. 569.
- Elrington's Ussher. Vol. I. pp. 107 & 108.
8. Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. II.
p. 130.
But cf. Bagwell. "The twelve bishops consecrated together at the Restoration were all of British birth or parent-
age . . . Most of them were worthy men, many of them great benefactors to the Church in which they filled high places, but it does not appear that any spoke Irish." pp. 321 & 322. Ireland under the Stuarts.
Vol. III.
9. Cf. Adair. True Narrative. p. 282.
10. Seymour. The Puritans in Ireland. p. 54.
- Cotton. Fasti Eccles. Hib. Vol. I. p. 239.
- Ware. Works. Vol. I. p. 160.
11. Reid. Vol. II. p. 267 seq.
- Latimer. History of the Irish Presbyterians. p. 129 seq.
12. Killen. Vol. II. p. 139.
13. Calendar of MSS. of Marquis of Ormonde. New Series.
Vol. IV. 1906. p. 26.
- The Regium Donum was a practical proof of the changed outlook. Killen. Vol. II. p. 139.
14. cf. Cambridge Modern History. Vol. V. ch. X.
Ireland from the Restoration to the Act of Resumption.
Robert Dunlop, M.A.
"No doubt, the restoration of Episcopacy and the ejection of their ministers caused much bitter feeling among the Presbyterians of Ulster, especially where they constituted the bulk of the population. But such struggles as these which soured the existence and frustrated the labours of Jeremy Taylor in the diocese of Down and Connor were happily exceptional; and it may be said that throughout the whole reign the /

- the position of the Protestant nonconformists in Ireland contrasted favourably with that of their fellows in England and Scotland." p. 304.
15. Adair. True Narrative. p. 296.
16. Described in Killen. Vol. II. p. 161 seq.
cf. J.R. Green. Short History of the English People.
"In Ireland his policy threw off even the disguise of law. Papists were admitted by the King's command to the Council and to civil offices. A Catholic, Lord Tyrconnell, was put at the head of the army, and set instantly about its reorganization by cashiering Protestant officers and by admitting two thousand Catholic natives into its ranks." p. 630.
"Tis by gentleness, instruction, and good example people are to be gained and not frightened into" the Catholic Church. "Our blessed Saviour whipt people out of the Temple, but I never heard He commanded any should be forced into it."
So James. See Life by J.S. Clarke. Vol. II. p. 621.
17. Reid. Vol. II. p. 353.
18. Macaulay.
"He had ruminated on the great enigmas which had been discussed in the Synod of Dort, and had found in the austere and inflexible logic of the Genevese school something which suited his intellect and his temper. That example of intolerance indeed which some of his predecessors had set he never imitated. For all persecution he felt a fixed aversion, which he avowed, not only where the avowal was obviously politic, but on occasions where it seemed that his interest would have been promoted by dissimulation or by silence. His theological opinions, however, were even more decided than those of his ancestors. The tenet of predestination was the keystone of his religion. He often declared that, if he were to abandon that tenet, he must abandon with it all belief in a superintending Providence, and must become a mere Epicurean."
History of England. Vol. I. p. 408.
19. Reid. Vol. II.
"But, strange to say, while their civil privileges were thus enlarged, the public exercise of their religious worship or church-government, though connived at, was still not only unsanctioned, but legally prohibited, under severe penalties." p. 421.
20. Mant. History of the Church of Ireland. Vol. II. p. 63.
21. Reid. Vol. II. p. 448.
22. Do. pp. 450-453.
23. Do. p. 453.
24. Latimer. History of the Irish Presbyterians. p. 257.
25. Mant. Vol. II. pp. 48, 113, 114 & 116.
26. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic. Ireland. 1691-2.
pp. 55 & 56.

27. Seymour. The Puritans in Ireland. p. 54.
Cotton. Fasti Eccles. Hib. Vol. I. p. 239.
28. Killen. Vol. II. p. 184.
29. Athenae Oxonienses. Vol. IV. Columns 562 & 563.
D.N.B. Vol. LX. Article "Edward Wetenhall."
(Alexander Gordon).
"In regard to concessions to dissenters, which he
advocated as early as 1682, he was prepared to go
further than the English Toleration Act." p. 383.
30. D.N.B. Article "William King." (Robert Dunlop).
Vol. XXXI.
"Though more of a party pamphlet than an impartial
history, it is a powerful vindication of the prin-
ciples of the revolution, and was, as Bishop Burnet
described it, 'not only the best book that hath been
written for the service of the government, but with-
out any figure it is worth all the rest put together,
and will do more than all our scribblings for settling
the minds of the nation.'" p. 164.
31. Reid. Vol. II. p. 427.
32. D.N.B. Article "William King." (Robert Dunlop).
Vol. XXXI. p. 165.

ATHANASIUS HIBERNICUS - JOHN BRAMHALL.

We now turn to give some account of the thought of the Irish accommodationists - as we did, it may be remembered, with those of England. Not, of course, that all of them were Irishmen. For the most part they were Englishmen, occupying Irish sees, a fact which gives us a rather curious feature of the finest and most influential students of comprehension in Ireland - they belonged, practically all of them, to the Establishment. In England, on the other hand, it was otherwise - they were taken both from the Church of England and the nonconformist bodies.

Let us begin with John Bramhall. He was born near Pontefract in 1594. He was ordained about 1616. After holding several preferments in England, he became Archdeacon of Meath in 1633, and Bishop of Derry in 1634. During the Commonwealth, except for a short visit to Ireland, he was abroad, chiefly at Paris and Brussels and in Spain. In October, 1660, he returned to England; and on January 18, 1661, he was translated from the see of Derry to the archbishopric of Armagh. He died on June 25, 1663.

To many it may seem strange to include him in the list of accommodationists, he being so often called the "Irish Laud" and "Bishop Bramble". To Adair, indeed, he was "that violent man" ¹ who "had been the principal persecutor of Nonconformists before the rebellion", ² while later Presbyterian historians, such as Reid and Killen, have spoken harshly of him. To the former he was /

was "the inveterate and now exasperated opponent of the Presbyterians",³ to the latter "a great stickler for rites and ceremonies",⁴ one who, while he "had distinguished himself in the department of polemic theology had an intense antipathy to Calvinism; and believed that religion could be best propagated, not so much by the preaching of the word, as by discipline enforced by state authority."⁵ On the whole, however, I think such criticism is rather unsympathetic, lacking, indeed, in appreciation of other points of view. Toleration, we must remember, was still in an early stage of its evolution. Inconsistencies can only be looked for - as we shall see later even more pertinently in the case of Jeremy Taylor. Men's teaching, assuredly, is still important even when practice fails to come up to its standard. The unstinted eulogies of Bramhall, surely, cannot all have been untruthful - Taylor's, for example, in his memorable funeral sermon -

"To sum up all: he was a wise prelate, a learned doctor, a just man, a true friend, a great benefactor to others, a thankful beneficiary where he was obliged himself. He was a faithful servant to his masters, a loyal subject to the king, a zealous assertor of his religion against popery in one side, and fanaticism on the other. The practice of his religion was not so much in forms and exterior ministries, though he was a great observer of all the public rites and ministries of the Church, as it was in doing good for others It will be hard to find his equal in all things For in him were visible the great lines of Hooker's judiciousness, of Jewel's learning, of the acuteness of Bishop Andrewes."⁶

Ware, too, paid unreserved tribute.⁷ "He was very considerable", declares Collier, "in the argumentative part of learning, a great controversial divine, a good governor and statesman, and furnished with courage suitable to his character and principles. He was far from /

from being straitlaced in his notions, and uncharitable in his censures; being famous for his distinction between articles of peace and articles of faith." ⁸

There is not the slightest doubt that Bramhall had a deep and lasting interest in accommodation - even the Roman Catholics not being beyond the limits of his vision.

"If you could be contented to wave your last four hundred years' determinations; or, if you liked them for yourselves, yet not to obtrude them upon other Churches; if you could rest satisfied with your old Patriarchal power and your 'principium unitatis', or primacy of order, much good might be expected from free Councils, and conferences from moderate persons; and we might yet live in hope to see an union, if not in all opinions, yet in charity and all necessary points of saving truth, between all Christians; to see the Eastern and Western Churches join hand in hand, and sing - 'Ecce quam bonum et quam jucundum est habitare fratres in unum' - 'Behold how good and pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.' But whilst you impose upon us daily new articles of Faith, and urge rigidly what you have unadvisedly determined; we dare not sacrifice truth to peace, nor be separated from the Gospel, to be joined to the Roman Church. Yet, in the point of our separation, and in all things which concern either doctrine or discipline, we profess all due obedience and submission to the judgment and definitions of the truly Catholic Church; lamenting with all our hearts the present condition of Christendom, which renders an Oecumenical Council, if not impossible (men's judgments may be had, where their persons cannot), yet very difficult; wishing one, as general as might be; and (until God sends such an opportunity) endeavouring to conform ourselves in all things, both in credendis et agendis, to whatsoever is uniform in the belief or practice, in the doctrine or discipline, of the Universal Church; and, lastly, holding an actual communion with all the divided parts of the Christian world in most things, et in voto - according to our desires - in all things." ⁹

Surely one who had such an ideal as this could not fail to include the Protestant bodies outside the Establishment.

No theologian of his century appreciated more than Bramhall the meaning of Catholicism or could describe it in more moving terms /

terms - Catholicism with him being the beginning of his thinking on the subject.

"To sum up all that hath been said; whosoever doth preserve his obedience entire to the universal Church, and its representative a general Council, and to all his superiors in their due order, so far as by law he is obliged; who holds an internal communion with all Christians, and an external communion so far as he can with a good conscience; who approves no reformation but that which is made by lawful authority, upon sufficient grounds, with due moderation; who derives his Christianity by the uninterrupted line of Apostolical succession; who contents himself with his proper place in the ecclesiastical body; who disbelieves nothing contained in Holy Scripture, and if he hold any errors unwittingly and unwillingly, doth implicitly renounce them by his fuller and more firm adherence to that infallible rule; who believeth and practiseth all those credenda and agenda, which the universal Church spread over the face of the earth doth unanimously believe and practise as necessary to salvation, without condemning or censuring others of different judgment from himself in inferior questions, without obtruding his own opinions upon others as articles of Faith; who is implicitly prepared to believe and do all other speculative and practical truths, when they shall be revealed to him; and, in sum, 'qui sententiam diversae opinionis vinculo non praeponit unitatis' - 'that prefers not a subtlety or an imaginary truth before the bond of peace;' he may securely say, 'My name is Christian, my surname is Catholic.'" ¹⁰

These words not only define the word "Catholic" - they lay down the road by which alone accommodation was possible viz:- a liberal appreciation of others, a refusal to be immersed in particularisms or in the making of mere opinions articles of faith. " As we shall see later, this was a line of argument with Jeremy Taylor too.

Naturally, Bramhall was an advocate of Episcopacy, defending it stoutly - with a breadth and latitude, however, which were truly helpful.

"As for our parts, we believe Episcopacy to be at least an Apostolical institution, approved by Christ Himself in the Revelation, ordained in the infancy of Christianity as a remedy against schism; and we bless God that we have a clear succession of it." ¹²

It is interesting, too, to see how he works out the grounds of his belief. His indebtedness to Field, Hammond and Andrewes is plain - although, and this is one of the strangest facts about Bramhall, he never names Hooker - Hooker, whom we have claimed as one of the principal inspirations of the accommodationists. Whatever be the explanation, that he did not know the works of the 'judicious' divine it is impossible to believe.

"The Serpent Salve: or, A Remedy for the biting of an asp", written in dialogue form in vindication of King Charles I., the author's first publication (1643), is the best source for these grounds. ("If you consider him as a scholar, his Excellency was in the Rationall and Argumentative part of Learning, and therefore as a Divine, he sate in the highest seat of polemick Theology" we may note, in passing, is Vesey's estimate).

First, then, there is the argument from the close connection of Episcopacy and English History.

"That which the Observer saith of monarchy, - that 'our laws are locked and cabinetted in it, in such manner, that the wounding of the one is the bleeding of the other' (though he forget it throughout his discourse), is likewise true of Episcopacy, that it is woven and riveted into the body of our law. Hear a witness beyond exception; - 'For the government of Bishops, I for my part, not prejudging the precedents of other Reformed Churches, do hold it warranted by the Word of God, and by the practice of the ancient Church in the better times, and much more convenient for kingdoms than parity of ministers or government by synods.'" ¹³

Secondly, sound argument there is in its antiquity and universality.

"Episcopacy is not only ancient and cemented into our laws, but also was universally received, without any opposition, or so much as a question, throughout the whole Christian world, /

world, among all sorts of Christians, of what communion or profession soever they were, Grecian, Latin, Russian, Armenian, Abyssene, &c., yea, even among those, who by reason of the great distance and remoteness of their countries never heard of the Pope, nor of the name of Rome, ever since the Apostles did tread upon the face of the earth, until this last century of years; so far it is from being a relic of Popery. And the Observer is challenged to name but one Church, or so much as one poor village, throughout the whole world, from the days of the Apostles till the year of Christ 1500, that ever was governed without a Bishop." ¹⁴

Thirdly, an argument there is of expediency - Episcopacy gives security.

"In a difference of ways, every pious and peaceable Christian, out of his discretion and care of his own salvation, will inquire which is 'via tutissima' - 'the safest way.' Now the separatists themselves (such as have either wisdom or learning) do acknowledge that holy orders are truly (that is, validly) given by the ordination used in our Church (I mean not such as either hold no outward calling to be needful, as the Anabaptists, or make the Church a mere democracy, as the Independents); but, on the other side, a very great part of the Christian world, and among them many Protestants, do allow no ordination to be right but from Bishops. And even St. Jerome, who of all the Fathers makes the least difference between a Bishop and a presbyter, yet saith, 'What can a Bishop do, which a presbyter doth not, except ordination?' And seeing there is required to the essence of a Church, first a pastor, secondly, a flock, thirdly, a subordination of this flock to this pastor; where we are not sure that there is right ordination, what assurance have we that there is a Church?" ¹⁵

Fourthly, there is its comprehensiveness, a feature so strongly emphasized by Bramhall as to make him anything but indifferent to accommodation. Ever was it his aim, as we have seen, to interpret the Church Articles as charitably as he could.

"He could not endure to see some men enslave their judgment to a person or a party, that cry up nothing more than Christian liberty. He thought that liberty was much confined by being chained to any man's chair, as if all he uttered were 'oracles', and to be made the standard and test of orthodoxy: that the Christian faith and liberty are then most in danger, when so many things are crowded into confessions, that what should be practical, becomes purely a science, /

science, of a rule of life an useless speculation, of a thing easy to be understood, a thing hard to be remembered: that it was the interest of the Protestant Church to widen her bottom, and make her Articles as charitable and comprehensive as she could, that those nicer accuracies, that divide the greatest wits in the world, might not be made the characteristics of reformation, and give occasion to one party to excommunicate and censure another. Thus he saw the Church of England constituted; both Calvinists and Arminians . . . subscribing the same propositions, and 'walking to the house of God as friends.' " 16

Strongly as Bramhall defended Episcopacy he is guarded in his utterance - good omen for the accommodationists - emphasizing the comprehensiveness of the Church and ever refusing to set any limits to God's spirit. So speaks he in "The Serpent-Salve."

"I write not this to prejudice our neighbour Churches. I dare not limit the extraordinary operation of God's Spirit, where ordinary means are wanting, without the default of the persons. He gave His people manna for food whilst they were in the wilderness. Necessity is a strong plea. Many Protestant Churches lived under kings and Bishops of another communion; others had particular reasons why they could not continue or introduce Bishops: but it is not so with us. It was as wisely as charitably said of St. Cyprian, - 'If any of my predecessors through ignorance or simplicity have not holden that which our Lord hath taught, the mercy of the Lord might pardon them', &c. So, if any Churches, through necessity, or ignorance, or new-fangledness, or covetousness, or practice of some persons, have swerved from the Apostolical rule, or primitive institution, 'the Lord may pardon them', or supply the defect of man; but we must not therefore presume. It is charity to think well of our neighbours, and good divinity to look well to ourselves. But the chief reason is, because I do not make this way to be simply necessary, but only shew what is safest, where so many Christians are of another mind. I know, that there is great difference between a valid and a regular ordination; and what some choice divines do write of case of necessity; and for my part am apt to believe, that God looks upon His people in mercy, with all their prejudices; and that there is a great latitude left to particular Churches, in the constitution of their ecclesiastical regiment, according to the exigence of time and place and persons, so as order and His own institution be observed." 17

Schism was a word Bramhall justly feared, no charge, indeed, being more odious to him than that the Church of England (and, of course, /

course, the Church of Ireland) was schismatic. Hence the strongly worded title of his Apologia - "A Just Vindication of the Church of England from the Unjust Aspersion of Criminal Schism. Wherein the nature of criminal schism, the divers sorts of schismatics, the liberties and privileges of national churches, the rights of sovereign magistrates, the tyranny, extortion, and schism of the Roman Court, with the grievances, complaints, and opposition, of all princes and states of the Roman Communion, of old and at this very day, are manifested to the view of the world."¹⁸ The Protestants, he indignantly retorts, were not the authors of the separation from Rome, but Roman Catholics;¹⁹ in abandoning the Court of Rome they did not make any new law, but only restored the old law of the land;²⁰ the ancient English, Scottish and Irish Churches are rightfully exempt from the patriarchal jurisdiction of Rome;²¹ the King and Church of England had sufficient authority to withdraw obedience;²² all kingdoms and republics of the Roman Communion do the same thing in effect, when they have occasion;²³ the Papacy itself is guilty schism.²⁴

That the Church of England was schismatic because it joined in communion of sacraments and public prayers with schismatics our author flatly denied.

"To communicate with heretics or schismatics in the same public assemblies, and to be present with them at the same Divine offices, is not always heresy or schism; unless one communicate with them in their heretical or schismatical errors."²⁵

No doubt individual churchmen might be guilty - that, however, was no argument against the church itself.

"A Church may be orthodox and Catholic, and yet sundry within its communion be heretics or schismatics or both. The Church of Corinth was a true Church of God, yet there wanted not schismatics and heretics among them. The churches of Galatia had many among them, who mixed Circumcision and the works of the law with the faith of Christ. The Church of Pergamus was a true Church, yet they had Nicolaitans among them, and those that held the doctrine of Balaam. The Church of Thyatira had a preaching Jezebel that seduced the servants of God." ²⁶

That Bramhall had no particular liking for the Scottish Presbyterians is plain from his writings. In the earlier period he was particularly bitter.

"But take heed, Sir, how you believe that any engagement of the Presbyterian faction in Scotland proceeded either from conscience, or gratitude, or fidelity, or aimed at the resettling of his Majesty upon his throne. No, no, their hearts were double, their treaties on their parts were mere treacheries from the beginning. I mean not any of those many loyal patriots, that never bowed their knees to Baalberith, the God of the Covenant, in that nation." ²⁷

Naturally, Bramwell's polemic against the Solemn League and Covenant is very strong, as we can see from "A Fair Warning to take heed of the Scottish Discipline". For him it is a wicked oath, imposed from without, undertaken through ignorance and error, disposing of the rights of the King without his consent, an oath to commit sin, invalidated by a prior and inconsistent oath - supremacy. ²⁸

"By all which it is most apparent, that this Covenant was neither free, nor deliberate, nor valid, nor lawful, nor consistent with our former oaths, but enforced, deceitful, invalid, impious, rebellious, and contradictory to our former engagements; and consequently obligeth no man to performance, but all men to repentance. For the greater certainty whereof, I appeal, upon this stating of the case, to all the learned casuists and divines in Europe, touching the point of common right; and that this is the true state of the case, I appeal to our adversaries themselves. No man, that hath any spark of ingenuity, will deny it. No Englishman who hath any tolerable degree of judgment, or knowledge in the laws of his country, can deny it, but at the same instant his conscience must give him the lie." ²⁹

And no doubt stories, particularly from Scotland, of the intolerance of the Solemn League and Covenant confirmed him in his views. He disliked, too, the Presbyterian denial of Royal Supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, the assertion of the supremacy of the people and their inconsistencies.³⁰ He even roundly accused them of helping Rome.³¹

Nevertheless, that a change came over Bramhall cannot be gainsaid. With all his deep fear of schism, by a closer contact, too, with the Presbyterians themselves he became much more accommodating. "He was very farr from any thing like Bigotry" says Vesey. "He had a great allowance & Charity for men of different perswasions, looking upon those Churches as in a tottering condition that stood upon nice opinions, as if the Temple were revers'd, and the weight of it to rest upon the pinnacles."

He would not condemn, for example, the foreign reformed churches.³² His plea, indeed, for an accommodating temper is interesting, containing, as it does, his usual emphasis on the avoiding of theological particularisms.

"If it were not for this Disciplinarian humour, which will admit no latitude in religion, but makes each nicety a fundamental, and every private opinion an article of Faith, which prefers particular errors before general truths, I doubt not but all reformed Churches might easily be reconciled."³³

This broader outlook spread to his attitude towards the Presbyterians. Admittedly, he was none too friendly to a Baxterian accommodation, criticising its vagueness.³⁴ Yet he showed his keenness to conciliate those who had been employed during the Cromwellian regime. At his first visitation after the Restoration, /

Restoration, he called for the letters of orders of his clergy.

The result is surely worthy of note -

"When the benefices were called over at the visitation, several appeared, and exhibited only such titles as they had received from the late powers. He told them, 'they were no legal titles, but in regard he heard well of them, he was willing to make such to them by institution and induction;' which they thankfully accepted of. - But when he desired to see their letters of orders, some had no other but their certificates of ordination by some Presbyterian classes, which, he told them, did not qualify them for any preferment in the Church. Upon this, the question arose, 'Are we not Ministers of the Gospel?' To which his Grace answered, That was not the question; at least, he desired for peace sake, that might not be the question for that time. 'I dispute not', said he, 'the value of your ordination, nor those acts you have exercised by virtue of it; what you are, or might be, here when there was no law, or in other Churches abroad. But we are now to consider ourselves as a national Church limited by law, which among other things takes chief care to prescribe about ordination; and I do not know how you could recover the means of the Church, if any should refuse to pay you your tithes, if you are not ordained as the law of this Church requireth; and I am desirous that she may have your labours, and you such portions of her revenue as shall be allotted you, in a legal and assured way.' By this means he gained such as were learned and sober." 35

Reordination took place but Bramhall's latitude is suggestive, as we see from another passage from his works.

"The writers above mentioned go on to remark, that 'the matter of reordination was a great difficulty in the last' (i.e. the seventeenth) 'century, with many non-conformist divines, who were otherwise disposed to have come over to the Church of England;' that 'the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of 1689 proposed to admit of some latitude in the affair;' and that 'Abp. Bramhall had furnished them with a precedent for so doing, by the manner in which he had received some Scotch Presbyters into the Church.' The extent of the latitude here hinted will be best seen by stating the instance given of it, viz. that, 'in the orders' (i.e. letters of orders) 'which he gave to Mr. Edward Parkinson, the following words were inserted:- 'Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit) nec invaliditatem eorundem determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros Ecclesiarum forinsecarum condemnantes, quos proprio Judici relinquimus, sed solummodo supplentes quicquid prius defuit per canones Ecclesiae Anglicanae requisitum, et providentes paci Ecclesiae, ut schismatis /

schismatis tollatur occasio, et conscientiis fidelium
satisfiat, nec ulli dubitent de ejus ordinatione, aut
actus suos presbyteriales tanquam invalidos aversentur." ³⁶

Such latitude was truly remarkable - a stage in the evolution of accommodation. "He did not determine", says Ware, "concerning the Validity or Invalidity of their Orders, but only was willing to supply what was before defective by the Canons of the Church of England, and to take away the Occasion of Schism. By this moderation he greatly softned the Spirit of Opposition, and gained over such as were Learned and Sober." ³⁷

Bramhall, then, saw that the faith consists not in negations but in affirmations, he requiring all that the Church requires without going out of his way to condemn anybody or anything - an attitude, assuredly, which ratifies his claim to a place among our accommodationist thinkers.

XXXII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Adair. True Narrative. p. 39.
2. Do. p. 244.
3. Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Vol. II. p. 254.
4. Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. II.
p. 17.
5. Do. pp. 17 & 18.
6. Bramhall's Works. Vol. I. p. lxxiv. seq.
7. Ware. Works. Vol. I. p. 118.
8. Collier. Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.
Vol. 8. p. 442.
9. Bramhall. Works. Vol. I. Answer to M. de la Milletiere.
pp. 80 & 81.

See also "Schism Guarded".

"The second proof of our moderation was our 'charity', - that we 'left them, as one should leave his father's house whilst it is infected' with some contagious sickness, with a hearty 'desire to return again so soon as it is cleansed'. This charitable desire of ours I proved by our daily prayers for them in our Litany, that God would bring them out of the way of error 'into the way of truth;' and particularly by our prayer on Good Friday for them, that God would 'have mercy upon all heretics,' and 'fetch them home to His Flock, that they may be saved among the remnant of true Israelites, and be made one Fold under one Shepherd Jesus Christ our Lord.'"

Works. Vol. II. p. 589.

Bramhall's dislike of the Romanists had reference rather to their Court than to their Church.

Works. Vol. I. p. 257.

He objected to their political influence.

"If weeds be of the essence of a garden, or corrupt humours or botches or wens and excrescences be of the essence of man; if errors and innovations and superstitions and superfluous rites and pecuniary arts be of the essence of a Church; then indeed we have forsaken the Roman Church in its essentials: otherwise not."

Works. Vol. II. p. 39.

"Nay, not only not from the Catholic Church, but not so much as from the Roman, did they separate per omnia, but only in those practices which they conceived superstitious or impious."

Do. p. 54.

See also - A Just Vindication of the Church of England.

Works. Vol. I. p. 199 seq.

Answer to an Epistle of M. de la Milletiere. Works.

Vol. I. p. 47.

10. Bramhall. Works. Vol. I. A Just Vindication of the Church of England. pp. 111 & 112.
11. Bramhall's passionate outburst on the Catholicism of the Church of England is a piece of beautiful eloquence. "No man can justly blame me for honouring my spiritual mother the Church of England; in whose womb I was conceived, at whose breasts I was nourished, and in whose bosom I hope to die. Bees, by the instinct of nature, do love their hives, and birds their nests. But God is my witness, that according to my uttermost talent, and poor understanding, I have endeavoured to set down the naked truth impartially, without either favour or prejudice, the two capital enemies of right judgment; - the one of which, like a false mirror, doth represent things fairer and straighter than they are; the other, like the tongue infected with choler, makes the sweetest meats to taste bitter. My desire hath been to have truth for my chiefest friend, and no enemy but error. If I have had any bias, it hath been desire of peace, which our common Saviour left as a legacy to His Church; that I might live to see the re-union of Christendom, for which I shall always bow the 'knees of my heart' to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is not impossible but that this desire of unity may have produced some unwilling error of love, but certainly I am most free from the wilful love of error. In questions of an inferior nature Christ regards a charitable intention much more than a right opinion. Howsoever it be, I submit myself and my poor endeavours, first, to the judgment of the Catholic Oecumenical essential Church; which if some of late days have endeavoured to hiss out of the schools as a fancy, I cannot help it. From the beginning it was not so. And if I should mistake the right Catholic Church out of human frailty or ignorance (which for my part I have no reason in the world to suspect; yet it is not impossible, when the Romanists themselves are divided into five or six several opinions, what this Catholic Church, or what their infallible judge is), I do implicitly and in the preparation of my mind submit myself to the true Catholic Church, the spouse of Christ, the mother of the Saints, the 'pillar of truth.'" Works. Vol. II. pp. 21 & 22. Epistle prefatory to "A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon."
12. Bramhall. A Just Vindication of the Church of England. Vol. I. p. 271.
13. Bramhall. Serpent-Salve. Works. Vol. III. p. 468. Ussher had a high opinion of this book. "I cannot sufficiently commend your dexterity in clearing those points, which have been so satisfactorily handled /

handled by those who have taken pains in the same argument before you, and I profess I have profited more thereby, than by any of the books I have read before, touching that subject." (Quoted by Vesey).

14. Bramhall. Serpent-Salve. Works. Vol. III. p. 469.
 15. Do. pp. 474 & 475.
 Christianity without bishops has led to sad results, says Bramhall.
 "If Bishops had not been, God knows what Churches, what religion, what sacraments, what Christ, we should have had at this day; and we may easily conjecture by that inundation of sects, which hath almost quite overwhelmed our poor Church on a sudden, since the authority of Bishops was suspended. The present condition of England doth plead more powerfully for Bishops, than all that have writ for Episcopacy since the reformation of our Church."
 The Serpent-Salve. Works. Vol. III. pp. 492 & 493.
 16. Bramhall. Works. Vol. I. pp. xviii-xix.
 17. Do. Serpent-Salve. Works. Vol. III. pp. 475 & 476.
 18. Do. Vol. I. p. 83.
 19. Do. Just Vindication of the Church of England. Works.
 Vol. I. p. 113 seq.
 20. Do. p. 129 seq.
 21. Do. p. 152 seq.
 22. Do. p. 165 seq.
 23. Do. p. 200 seq.
 24. Do. p. 246 seq.
 25. Do. A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon. Works.
 Vol. II. p. 46.
 26. Do. p. 48.
 27. Do. Answer to the Epistle of M. de la Milletiere. Works.
 Vol. I. p. 74.
 28. Do. Fair Warning to take heed of the Scottish Discipline.
 Works. Vol. III. pp. 282-285.
 29. Do. p. 285.
 30. Do. Serpent-Salve. Works. Vol. III. pp. 302-312.
 31. Do. Answer to the Epistle of M. de la Milletiere. Works.
 Vol. I. p. 36.
 32. Do. Fair Warning to take heed of the Scottish Discipline.
 Works. Vol. III. p. 242.
 See also "Vindication of Grotius and Episcopalians from Popery." Works. Vol. III. pp. 517 & 532.
 33. Do. Fair Warning to take heed of the Scottish Discipline.
 Works. Vol. III. p. 243.
 Says Vesey in Life of Bramhall -

"We do not understand how every different opinion makes a division between Churches, unless every opinion must pass for an Article of faith, and the whole Systeme of Christianity were in danger of being dissolved, if there were not an entire agreement in those speculations, in which there will never be an accord, till all men have the /

the same complexions, and Tutors, and prejudices." Bramhall "is much celebrated for that distinction between Articles necessary for Peace and Order, & those that are necessary to Salvation, for the wholesome & healing vertue that is in it, towards the cure of Schisme. And he hath often declared that the Church was not to be healed but by General propositions."

cf. Dr. Darwell Stone who gives an excellent example of Bramhall's disinclination to give particularist definitions with regard to the Eucharist.

"His teaching on this subject differs considerably from that of Cosin and of Jeremy Taylor, and at times shows a tendency to leave open both Transubstantiation and the question whether the presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament is to be connected with the consecrated elements before Communion or restricted to the reception by the faithful communicants."

A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

Vol. II. pp. 337 & 338.

34. Bramhall. Vindication of Grotius and Episcopalians from Popery. Works. Vol. III. p. 563 seq.

"Baxter was one of those good men who never know when they are beaten; otherwise this extraordinarily powerful work would have crushed his not very powerful adversary."

Overton. Life in the English Church. 1660-1714. p. 350 note.

35. Bramhall. Works. Vol. I. p. xxiv.

36. Do. p. xxxvii.

37. Ware. Works. Vol. I. pp. 123 & 124.

There is some doubt regarding Bramhall's participation in conditional ordinations.

W.J. Sparrow Simpson says -

"But even if he did take that step, which is highly improbable, it would be nothing more than an archiepiscopal innovation, for which the individual occupant of the office would be personally responsible, but to which the Church was by no means committed. There is no record of any Provincial action in the case: no approval officially by the Irish Episcopate."

Bramhall. p. 237.

JEREMY TAYLOR - THE LIBERTY of PROPHECYING.

(We now come to Jeremy Taylor whose great treatise, the "Liberty of Prophecying", is one of the classics of the accommoda- tionists, to be ranked, indeed, with Stillingfleet's Irenicum - a work the importance of which (for our study) cannot very well be over-estimated. "While Hales and Chillingworth only dealt incid- entally with the practical question of toleration", says Dr. G.P. Gooch, "the Chrysostom of the English Church raised his voice in an express plea for religious comprehension." ¹ A noble contribu- tion it was to the subject. Admittedly, in some quarters, at least, it has been over eulogized. ² Disparaged, too, by Samuel Rutherford, it yet commanded the admiration of Milton and S.T. Coleridge. "On the whole", says Bishop Dowden, "there is perhaps no work in our Anglican theological literature more sure to arrest and hold attention, more stimulating, more provocative of thought than the 'Liberty of Prophecying'; as there is certainly no more brilliant manifestation of Taylor's intellectual powers." ³

Impossible it is to dissent from Dr. Parr's opinion - cor- roborated by Heber - that while Englishmen revere Barrow and admire Hooker they love Jeremy Taylor. ⁴ His learning was vast, encyclopaedic, indeed, Heber, his biographer, furnishing us with more than nine hundred authors whom he quotes, including the Greek and Latin classic writers then accessible, medieval casuists, Church historians, Greek and Latin Fathers, Schoolmen, continental theologians /

theologians and controversialists of many ages, not to mention his own contemporaries. Nevertheless, we cannot honestly say Jeremy Taylor is in the first rank as a thinker.⁵ "The Liberty of Propheying", declares Saintsbury, "is an argument for toleration which would have been more effective if the author had been a closer reasoner, and perhaps also if he had not been on the losing side at the time."⁶ His fertility of imagination and command of language, however, never left him at a loss for arguments.

What was the object of the "Liberty of Propheying"? Was it, as Willmott says, to plead the cause of the persecuted Church of England?⁷ Or was it, as Hallam apparently hints - following Wood - a stratagem to introduce dissension into the Presbyterian ranks?⁸ Surely, if we are to believe Taylor himself, it was wider and more spiritual.

"We by this time are come to that pass, we think we love not God except we hate our brother; and we have not the virtue of religion, unless we persecute all religions but our own; for lukewarmness is so odious to God and man, that we, proceeding furiously upon these mistakes, by supposing we preserve the body, we destroy the soul of religion; or by being zealous for faith, or which is all one, for that which we mistake for faith, we are cold in charity, and so lose the reward of both.

All these errors and mischiefs must be discovered and cured, and that is the purpose of this discourse."⁹

It is, perhaps, somewhat difficult to appreciate fully Taylor's work - as Bramhall's - because of our haunting sense of the apparent inconsistency of thought and deed, of teaching and practice. How could the persecutor of Down and Connor be the exponent of liberty of preaching or interpretation or, as he puts it, propheying?¹⁰ "He found a great difference", says Bagwell, "between /

"between philosophising as a scholar and governing as a bishop",¹¹ the truth being that in post-Restoration Ireland toleration was a doctrine that could hardly be practised. Circumstances were not congenial. Besides, the charge of inconsistency suggests itself more obviously to the modern mind than to that of the seventeenth century - toleration not then being the virtue it now is.

As an accommodationist Taylor reminds us, perhaps, most strongly of Baxter, the resemblance, indeed, being altogether remarkable. Both, be it recalled, were preachers, controversialists, theologians, casuists and devotional writers. Both, too, were outside party grooves. Again, both left pleas for a wider tolerance of theological views, in each case, indeed, being suspected of doctrinal laxity. Both, also, were charged with inconsistency. On the other hand, the differences are patent. Taylor, trained at Oxford and Cambridge, the protégé of Laud, the companion of Juxon and Sheldon, was, strangely enough, the author of the "Liberty of Propheying", an unlooked-for emanation from such an environment. Baxter, too, self-taught, brought up with an unhappy experience of Episcopacy, could yet rise above his prejudices to dream the dreams of Ussher. More than passing strange is it, accordingly, that Taylor and Baxter do not appear to have had any connection, and scarcely ever refer to one another - and that despite the fact they were arguing along similar lines of accommodation thought.

And now we turn to give some account of the "Liberty of Propheying", another of the great text-books of the accommodationists. /

accommodationists. Its date is 1647 - not, of course, a product of Taylor's Irish period at all.¹² (Nevertheless, it is natural to deal with it here.

Taylor's style is generally stated to be unequalled for wealth of illustration, exuberant fulness of thought, grandeur of diction - inclining, perhaps, to floridness. In this work, however, it is otherwise - the style is clear, simple and unadorned, at times, indeed, a little dry with, too, an absence of the far-famed Taylorian pomp of imagery.

The introduction to the "Liberty" gives us the author's first principle - that differences in religious opinion are inevitable, an inevitability, however, which should not issue in the hostility of parties.

"Few men in the mean time considered, that so long as men had such variety of principles, such several constitutions, educations, tempers, and distempers, hopes, interests, and weaknesses, degrees of light, and degrees of understanding, it was impossible all should be of one mind, and what is impossible to be done is not necessary it should be done; and therefore, although variety of opinions was impossible to be cured, (and they who attempted it did like him who claps his shoulder to the ground to stop an earthquake,) yet the inconveniences arising from it might possibly be cured, not by uniting their beliefs, - that was to be despaired of, - but by curing that which caused these mischiefs, and accidental inconveniences of their disagreeings."¹³

"But men are now-a-days, and indeed always have been, since the expiration of the first blessed ages of Christianity, so in love with their own fancies and opinions, as to think faith and all Christendom is concerned in their support and maintenance; and whoever is not so fond and does not dandle them like themselves, it grows up to a quarrel, which because it is in materia theologiae is made a quarrel in religion, and God is entitled to it; and then if you are once thought an enemy to God, it is our duty to persecute you even to death, we do God good service in it."¹⁴

The cause of mischief and disunion, Taylor argues, does not really /

really lie in diversity of thought - that being inevitable - but in want of charity and breadth of mind. "All these mischiefs", runs a famous passage, "proceed not from this, that all men are not of one mind, for that is neither necessary nor possible, but that every opinion is made an article of faith, every article is a ground of a quarrel, every quarrel makes a faction, every faction is zealous, and all zeal pretends for God, and whatsoever is for God cannot be too much." ¹⁵

And now, in order to track down the origin of "errors and mischiefs" ¹⁶ Taylor makes an enquiry into the "nature of faith".

"First, then, it is of great concernment to know the nature and integrity of Faith: for there begins our first and great mistake. For faith, although it be of great excellency, yet when it is taken for a habit intellectual, it hath so little room and so narrow a capacity, that it cannot lodge thousands of those opinions which pretend to be of her family." ¹⁷

Faith, indeed, is not an "intellectual habit" at all. Rather is it a simple personal acceptance of Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

Now, naturally, if such a proposition were accepted, a strong foundation for accommodation would be provided, so many causes of division being at once removed - which, of course, suits Taylor's argument admirably and meets his end.

"So that although we must neither deny nor doubt of any thing, which we know our great Master hath taught us; yet salvation is in special, and by name, annexed to the belief of those articles only, which have in them the endearments of our services, or the support of our confidence, or the satisfaction of our hopes, such as are - Jesus Christ the Son of the living God, the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, forgiveness of sins by his blood, resurrection of the dead, and life eternal; because these propositions qualify Christ for our Saviour and our Lawgiver, the one to engage our services, the other to endear them; for so much is necessary as will make us to be his servants, and his disciples; and /

and what can be required more? This only: salvation is promised to the explicit belief of those articles, and therefore those only are necessary, and those are sufficient." ¹⁸

To the proposition that everything deducible from these articles must also necessarily be believed our author has his reply -

"It is true, if he sees the deduction and coherence of the parts; but it is not certain that every man shall be able to deduce whatsoever is either immediately, or certainly deducible from these premises; and then, since salvation is promised to the explicit belief of these, I see not how any man can justify the making the way to heaven narrower than Jesus Christ hath made it, it being already so narrow, that there are few that find it." ¹⁹

Further, when Taylor looks for a summary of the truths necessary for salvation he finds it in the Apostles' Creed. Such a creed, if adequate in the early church, he says, did not cease to be so in his own day.

"And therefore they are no argument sufficient that the first ages of the church, which certainly were the best, did much recede from that which I showed to be the sense of the Scripture and the practice of the apostles; they all contented themselves with the apostles' creed as the rule of the faith." ²⁰

Deductions, of course, can be made from the Creed - these, however, are not to be raised to the status of articles of faith. In other words, the right of the Church to add 'credenda' is denied.

"And, indeed, if the church, by declaring an article, can make that to be necessary which before was not necessary, I do not see how it can stand with the charity of the church, so to do, (especially after so long experience she hath had, that all men will not believe every such decision or explication,) for by so doing, she makes the narrow way to heaven narrower, and chalks out one path more to the devil than he had before, and yet the way was broad enough when it was at the narrowest." ²¹

This principle, far-reaching in its effects, was one of the most important /

important of all for the accommodationist thinkers. Time and again have we not seen "particularisms" to rank as the foes of every scheme of comprehension? Linked to this broad outlook, too, was Taylor's (later) comprehensive idea of the Church - which, for him, was the body of all who believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world, those going beyond this being the true authors of schism and heresy.

As regards church polity, our author, of course, believes in Episcopacy. His "Episcopacy Asserted", published in 1642, was worked out on the usual orthodox Anglican lines - Christ instituted a church²² committed to his apostles²³ with power of transmission to successors;²⁴ the difference of the twelve and the seventy accounted for the difference of the bishops and presbyters²⁵ (a regular Anglican argument); the episcopate was distinct from the presbyterate²⁶ because the presbyterate was a step to it,²⁷ promotion was by new ordination,²⁸ presbyters never joined in laying hands upon those who were consecrated to the higher office.²⁹ Bishops had a power distinct from and superior to that of Presbyters³⁰ - as of ordination,³¹ confirmation³² and jurisdiction.³³ They are schismatics who separate from their bishop.³⁴ Into the validity of these arguments, of course, we need not enter.³⁵ There is no trace, obviously, of the comprehensiveness of the later "Liberty of Prophesying". In the five years, however, which separated the works a marked evolution of thought took place. Whatever his own private convictions, Taylor did not, in the interest of accommodation, continue to press them. Episcopacy for him became /

became the 'bene esse' of the Church, not its 'esse' - a position, surely, which had to be admitted if any form of comprehension was to be tried at all.

Continuing the argument of the "Liberty", our author deals with the "nature of heresy" - a most important chapter, indeed. In brief, Taylor's position is that heresy does not consist in speculative idiosyncrasy but in a wicked opinion, an ungodly doctrine - and so it was, he says, in Scripture times.

"For heresy is not an error of the understanding, but an error of the will. And this is clearly insinuated in Scripture, in the style whereof faith and a good life are made one duty, and vice is called opposite to faith, and heresy opposed to holiness and sanctity." ³⁶

"Now every man that errs, though in a matter of consequence, so long as the foundation is entire, cannot be suspected justly guilty of a crime to give his error a formality of heresy; for we see many a good man miserably deceived; (as we shall make it appear afterwards;) and he that is the best amongst men, certainly hath so much humility to think he may be easily deceived; and twenty to one but he is, in something or other; yet, if his error be not voluntary, and part of an ill life, then because he lives a good life, he is a good man, and therefore no heretic: no man is an heretic against his will." ³⁷

"A wicked person in his error becomes heretic, when the good man in the same error shall have all the rewards of faith." ³⁸

"But, however, I find no opinions in Scripture called damnable but what are impious in their effect upon the life, or directly destructive of the faith or the body of Christianity." ³⁹

This view of heresy - as that which strikes at the foundation of Christianity embodied in the Apostles' Creed ⁴⁰ - was certainly sufficiently wide and comprehensive to commend itself to the accommodationists, being, indeed, one of their main principles.

Perhaps, /

Perhaps, however, Taylor has his greatest interest for us when he proceeds to examine the alleged special sources of authority in religious opinion. Of these Scripture is one. Yet, says our author, while the truth that maketh "wise unto salvation" is assuredly plain there is no infallible declaration of theological opinion in Scripture.

"Since Holy Scripture is the repository of divine truths, and the great rule of faith, to which all sects of Christians do appeal for probation of their several opinions; and since all agree in the articles of the creed, as things clearly and plainly set down, and as containing all that which is of simple and prime necessity; and since, on the other side, there are in Scripture many other mysteries, and matters of question upon which there is a veil; since there are so many copies, with infinite varieties of reading; since a various interpunction, a parenthesis, a letter, an accent, may much alter the sense; since some places have divers literal senses, many have spiritual, mystical, and allegorical meanings; since there are so many tropes, metonymies, ironies, hyperboles, proprieties, and improprieties of language, whose understanding depends upon such circumstances that it is almost impossible to know its proper interpretation, now that the knowledge of such circumstances and particular stories is irrevocably lost; since there are some mysteries which, at the best advantage of expression, are not easy to be apprehended, and whose explication, by reason of our imperfections, must needs be dark, sometimes weak, sometimes unintelligible; and lastly, since those ordinary means of expounding Scripture, as searching the originals, conference of places, parity of reason, and analogy of faith, are all dubious, uncertain, and very fallible, - he that is the wisest, and by consequence the likeliest to expound truest in all probability of reason, will be very far from confidence; because every one of these, and many more, are like so many degrees of improbability and uncertainty, all depressing our certainty of finding out truth in such mysteries, and amidst so many difficulties. And, therefore, a wise man that considers this, would not willingly be prescribed to by others; and, therefore, if he also be a just man, he will not impose upon others; for it is best every man should be left in that liberty from which no man can justly take him, unless he could secure him from error: so that here also there is a necessity to conserve the liberty of prophesying and interpreting Scripture; a necessity derived from the consideration of the difficulty of Scripture in questions controverted, and the uncertainty of any internal medium of interpretation." "

Tradition is the next of the authorities mentioned by Taylor. Here again, however, infallibility is not to be found.

"Since, beside the no necessity of traditions, there being abundantly enough in Scripture, there are many things called traditions by the fathers, which they themselves either proved by no authors, or by apocryphal and spurious, and heretical, - the matter of tradition will, in very much, be so uncertain, so false, so suspicious, so contradictory, so improbable, so unproved, that if a question be contested, and be offered to be proved only by tradition, it will be very hard to impose such a proposition to the belief of all men, with any imperiousness or resolved determination; but it will be necessary men should preserve the liberty of believing and prophesying, and not part with it, upon a worse merchandize and exchange than Esau made for his birth-right." ⁴²

Nor do general councils fare much better. They have never been declared by the Church to be infallible; ⁴³ they have contradicted one another; ⁴⁴ they have often, indeed, been corrupt; ⁴⁵ and finally have, on occasion, undoubtedly erred. ⁴⁶

As regards papal infallibility it is not necessary here to speak. Taylor, of course, combats the theory along the usual lines.

"But I am too long in this impertinency. If I were bound to call any man master upon earth, and to believe him upon his own affirmative and authority, I would, of all men, least follow him that pretends he is infallible and cannot prove it. For that he cannot prove it, makes me as uncertain as ever; and that he pretends to infallibility makes him careless of using such means which will morally secure those wise persons, who, knowing their own aptness to be deceived, use what endeavours they can to secure themselves from error, and so become the better and more probable guides." ⁴⁷

Nor can the Fathers be accepted as the authority. Innumerable are the topics on which they disagreed, ⁴⁸ the errors, too, into which they fell. ⁴⁹

But all this, it may be objected, is purely negative and destructive. /

destructive. Where, then, is the authority to be found? The answer is - in reason. In saying this, of course, Taylor was no Rationalist in the modern sense.⁵⁰ Never did it occur to him to place reason in opposition to religion, only to authority; not to revelation, only to quasi-authoritative interpretations of revealed law. In the conscientious exercise of private judgment is the best security. Of course, reason may err without, however, being culpable, what is plain to one understanding being obscure to another.⁵¹ All the same, it is not required of us not to be in error, only that we endeavour to avoid it.

"No error, neither for itself, nor its consequents, is to be charged as criminal upon a pious person, since no simple error is a sin, nor does condemn us before the throne of God, since he is so pitiful to our crimes, that he pardons many de toto et integro, in all makes abatement for the violence of temptation, and the surprisal and invasion of our faculties, and, therefore, much less will demand of us an account for our weaknesses."⁵²

For the most part, the remainder of the "Liberty" need not detain us - it has reference to toleration rather than to accommodation, a toleration remarkable, be it noted, as ranging all the way from Anabaptism⁵³ to Roman Catholicism.⁵⁴ The last section, however, is certainly apposite to our purpose - "That particular Men may communicate with Churches of different Persuasions, and how far they may do it," from which we gather that Taylor would have liked to see intercommunion between different Churches on a wider scale.

"As for the duty of particular men in the question of communicating with churches of different persuasions, it is to be regulated according to the laws of those churches; for if they require no impiety or any thing unlawful as the condition /

condition of their communion, then they communicate with them as they are servants of Christ, as disciples of his doctrine, and subjects to his laws; and the particular distinguishing doctrine of his sect hath no influence or communication with him who, from another sect, is willing to communicate with all the servants of their common Lord: for since no church of one name is infallible, a wise man may have either the misfortune, or a reason, to believe of every one in particular that she errs in some article or other; either he cannot communicate with any, or else he may communicate with all that do not make a sin or the profession of an error to be the condition of their communion. And therefore, as every particular church is bound to tolerate disagreeing persons, in the senses and for the reasons above explicated, so every particular person is bound to tolerate her; that is, not to refuse her communion when he may have it upon innocent conditions." ⁵⁵

This was a suggestive admission. After all, Episcopacy - of which Taylor was a loyal advocate - was an accidental of the Church and not an essential. Taylor, we see, never argued for the uniting of religious bodies on the basis of a minimum-belief ⁵⁶ - all he proposed was that those who subscribed to the Apostles' Creed should leave each other alone in other matters, whether of faith or discipline, instead of enforcing what was bound to be in the end an irreligious compliance. ⁵⁷

Such, then, is the gist of the famous "Liberty of Propheying". Its indebtedness to Chillingworth ⁵⁸ is obvious, especially in the plea that the issues which separated Christians, at any rate Protestants, were not matters of faith but of speculation - as also in the plea that the Apostles' Creed was the best just because it was the simplest. No exaggeration is it to claim that the debt of the accommodationists to Taylor was incalculable, he being so largely responsible for providing the philosophic basis of the movement. Stillingfleet, at a later date, could write in the spirit of Hales, Chillingworth and Taylor himself. In his case, however. /

however, the battle was largely with the claim of divine right - Taylor's, on the other hand, was with theological particularisms. Only by getting rid of both could the vision of accommodation materialize. The same ideal it was - seen, however, from different angles.

XXXIII. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. G.P. Gooch. Political Thought from Bacon to Halifax.
pp. 207 & 208.
2. Gosse.
"The importance of this wonderful book, from the theological and philosophical side is so great that many writers have not scrupled to give it the highest place among the works of its author."
Jeremy Taylor. p. 42.
3. Dowden. Theological Literature of the Church of England.
pp. 131 & 132.
4. cf. Earl of Conway to Major George Rawdon.
"I am certain he (Jeremy Taylor) is the choicest person in England appertaining to the conscience, and let others blemish him how they please, yet all I have written of him is true. He is a man of excellent parts and an excellent life."
Rawdon Papers. p. 188.
5. cf. Cattermolé.
"Though accomplished, even beyond his contemporaries, in an age abounding in learned theologians, in the use of every weapon of polemical warfare, the mind of Jeremy Taylor was not formed for controversy; and when he engaged in it, it was never for the triumph of an opinion, but for the extension of truth and the promotion of godliness."
Introductory Essay to his Edition of the "Liberty of Propheying". p. xxvi.
- cf. Marcus Dods.
"His mind was neither scientific nor speculative."
Article "Jeremy Taylor" in Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- cf. Tulloch.
"He is a scholastic in argument, a pietist in feeling, a poet in fancy and expression; he is not a thinker."
Contemporary Review. Vol. 9. p. 247.
- cf. Heber.
"As a reasoner, I do not think him matchless. He is, indeed, always acute, and, in practical questions, almost always sensible. His knowledge was so vast, that on every point of discussion, he set out with great advantage, as being familiar with all the necessary preliminaries of the question, and with every ground or argument which had been elicited on either side by former controversies. But his own understanding was rather inventive than critical."
Life of Taylor. p. ccci.
6. Saintsbury. Short History of English Literature. p. 440.
7. Willmott. Jeremy Taylor. p. 122.
Also Dowden. Theological Literature of the Church of England. p. 127.

8. Hallam. Introduction to the Literature of Europe.
Vol. II. p. 451.
9. Wood. Athenae Oxonienses. Vol. III. Column 786.
Introduction to Liberty of Prophesying. p. 6.
10. Killen. Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Vol. II.
p. 137.
Carte refers to the repeated attempts made by Taylor to conciliate the Presbyterians.
"He invited them to friendly conferences, desired earnestly to speak with them, went to them, sent some of their own sect to invite them, offered to satisfy them in any thing that was reasonable, preached every Sunday amongst them some where or other, and courted them with the kindest offers. All the effect this had upon the Ministers was, that it put them upon entering into a new Covenant, to speak with no Bishop, and to endure neither their government nor their persons."
Life of Ormonde. Vol. II. p. 208.
11. Bagwell. Ireland under the Stuarts. Vol. III. p. 320.
12. Overton.
"At the Restoration he was at once removed to the sister Church of Ireland. Why the Church of England did not keep one of the greatest of her sons at home is not clear."
"What makes it all the more provoking is that the people in his remote Irish diocese do not seem to have appreciated as they ought to have done the treasure that was thrown away among them."
Life in the English Church. 1660-1714. p. 34.
13. Liberty of Prophesying. (Cattermole's Ed.) p. 2.
14. Do. p. 4.
15. Do. p. 6.
16. Do.
17. Do. p. 7.
18. Do. pp. 10 & 11.
19. Do. p. 11.
20. Do. p. 55.
See also pp. 15 & 16.
"But if this was sufficient to bring men to heaven then, why not now? If the apostles admitted all to their communion that believed this creed, why shall we exclude any that preserve the same entire? Why is not our faith of these articles of as much efficacy for bringing us to heaven, as it was in the churches apostolical? - who had guides more infallible, that might without error have taught them superstructures enough, if they had been necessary. And so they did: but that they did not insert them into the creed, when they might have done it with as much certainty as these articles, makes it clear to my understanding, that other things were not necessary, but these were."

21. Liberty of Propheying. pp. 20 & 21.
 22. Episcopacy Asserted. Vol. VII. of Works. p. 7 seq.
 23. Do. p. 10 seq.
 24. Do. p. 11 seq.
 25. Do. p. 22.
 26. Do. p. 113 seq.
 27. Do. p. 116 seq.
 28. Do. p. 117 seq.
 29. Do. p. 120 seq.
 30. Do. p. 127 seq.
 31. Do.
 32. Do. p. 143 seq.
 33. Do. p. 151 seq.
 34. Do. p. 235 seq.
 35. Taylor's inconsistencies are referred to by Hallam and instances given in "Introduction to the Literature of Europe". Vol. II. p. 452.
 36. Liberty of Propheying. pp. 31 & 32.
 cf. E.R.E. Vol. XII. Article "Unitarianism".
 (J.E. Carpenter).
 "Writers so different as Hales, Jeremy Taylor, and Milton declare in almost the same words that heresy is not a matter of the understanding; the faithful pursuit of reason did not make a heretic; the mischief lay in the influences that perverted the will."
 p. 522.
 37. Liberty of Propheying. p. 39.
 38. Do. p. 58.
 39. Do. p. 75.
 40. Do. p. 80.
 41. Do. pp. 113 & 114.
 42. Do. p. 140.
 43. Do. p. 160.
 44. Do.
 45. Do. p. 163.
 46. Do. p. 166.
 47. Do. p. 212.
 48. Do. p. 214.
 49. Do. p. 219.
 50. cf. Fraser Mitchell.
 "Taylor's connection early in life with those divines who gathered about Falkland at Great Tew and prepared the way to some extent for the rationalistic divines, though themselves afterwards practically compelled to renounce the more purely philosophic standpoint from which they set out, is apparent from a statement which occurs in the 'Preface' to 'The Great Exemplar.'" English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson. p. 244.
 "Taylor concludes this rational treatise in the same spirit in which he began it. He sets a higher value on /

on a good life than on an orthodox creed. He estimates every doctrine by its capacity to do men good."

Hunt. Religious Thought in England. Vol. I. p. 340.

Surely Lecky is wide of the mark -

"As far, therefore, as he was a sceptic, Taylor was a rationalist, and as far as he was a rationalist he was an advocate of toleration."

Rationalism in Europe. Vol. II. p. 80.

51. Liberty of Propheying. p. 243.

52. Do. p. 269.

53. Do. p. 316 seq.

54. Do. p. 353 seq.

55. Do. pp. 373 & 374.

56. cf. Heber.

"He justifies himself from the charge of a latitudinarian indifference to all religions, and recommends to the champions of the faith the use of no other weapons than those which suit the Christian warfare: such as 'preaching and disputation (so that neither of them breed disturbance,) charity and sweetness, holiness of life, assiduity of exhortation, the word of God and prayer.'"

Life. p. cci.

57. cf. Hallam. Introduction to the Literature of Europe.

Vol. II.

"Taylor, therefore, may be said to have been the first who sapped and shook the foundations of dogmatism and pretended orthodoxy; the first who taught men to seek peace in unity of spirit rather than of belief; and, instead of extinguishing dissent, to take away its sting by charity, and by a sense of human fallibility."

p. 451.

D.N.B. Article "Jeremy Taylor". (Alexander Gordon).

Vol. XIX. p. 427.

"Its range is narrowed by the fact that the common profession of Christianity is assumed throughout."

The breadth of the "Liberty of Propheying", accordingly, is more apparent than real.

cf. Gosse.

"He was careful to limit his plea for toleration to those who unite in the Christian Creed, but this was of slight importance in that day, when, in the civilised parts of Europe, it would have been difficult to discover persons not Jews or atheists not nominally covered by this general confession. He does not say, so far as I have been able to discover, a single word which would exclude from toleration those outside the Christian pale; he merely does not consider them."

Jeremy Taylor. p. 47.

cf. G.P. Gooch.

"Though he only demands toleration for Christians, there is not a word to exclude those beyond the pale. The only exceptions from his wide charity are the teachers of rebellion and immorality."

Political Thought from Bacon to Halifax. p. 210.

58. Gosse.

"It is true, as S.R. Gardiner has pointed out, that 'three-fourths of its argument were written under the influence of Chillingworth's Religion of a Protestant.'"

Jeremy Taylor. p. 40.

cf. J.R. Green.

"Taylor, like Chillingworth, rested his hope of union on the simplification of belief."

Short History of the English People. p. 581.

XXXIV.

JAMES USSHER - 1641.

We may now fittingly conclude this work with a study of James Ussher, the culminating figure in the evolution of comprehension, the prince, indeed, of accommodationists. Chronologically, doubtless, we should have dealt with him before Bramhall and Taylor - his importance, however, is such that we are justified surely in keeping him to the last.

Surprise may be expressed that in narrating the Irish period of our subject we have not heard far more of him. Apart from his participation in the drawing up of the Irish Articles of 1615 has his name not occurred but little? How came he to be the greatest of all? Assuredly, the reason was not that his written work on this particular subject was more voluminous than that of others. Ussher, in fact, produced no such treatise as Taylor's "Liberty of Propheying" or Stillingfleet's "Irenicum". As we shall see, his accommodationist works are the merest pamphlets or tracts. No doubt his prodigious name as a scholar was such as to add interest to any subject in which he participated. His monumental and massive learning, indeed, enabled him to overcome the bitter ecclesiastical prejudices of the seventeenth century to the extent of winning the eulogies of Episcopalians,¹ Presbyterians² and Independents³ alike. Such a historic personage - one, indeed, who commanded universal respect and admiration was well fitted to be the ^{in cum} seventeenth century accommodationist par excellence. The most potent /

potent reason, however, for his subsequent place and name was the fact that Ussher was more than a theorist. He produced a practical scheme - the famous "Reduction" - which was solemnly discussed and debated not only by churchmen but by Princes and Parliaments as well - a workable scheme in the opinion of many and well calculated to bring about the desired accommodation of Episcopalians and Presbyterians. Ussher, in short, raised the whole question above the mere academic level to the realm of practical ecclesiastical politics. Such a verdict could not be passed on Jeremy Taylor whose contribution was solely to the philosophic basis of the movement, never to its practical fruition. Ussher assuredly at all times commands our respect. Doubtless he made his mistakes, his study ever being more congenial to him than his see, yet our love of him remains unaffected. The only other churchman of his time in Ireland, indeed, whom we can compare with him is William Bedell,⁴ for whom our admiration, too, is unreserved.

We have already seen the comprehensive nature of the Episcopal Irish Church during the period Ussher was Bishop of Meath and later Archbishop of Armagh⁵ - ground there is no need to retrace. He, we know, has the credit for much of this tolerant atmosphere - a fact gratefully acknowledged by the Presbyterians.⁶ Again, the Irish Articles of 1615, as we have seen, by their complete silence concerning the principles of church government, kept the gates of accommodation open,⁷ Ussher here, once more, largely being responsible.⁸

Now, /

Now, however, we must turn to a short account of his works, those, particularly, which have reference to accommodationist action, culminating in the famous "Reduction".

And first there is the "Original of Bishops and Metropolitans, briefly laid down", published in 1641 - a work undertaken at the request of Bishop Hall.⁹ The ground of Episcopacy, says the author, is derived in part from the pattern prescribed by God in the Old Testament.

"The government of the Church of the Old Testament was committed to the priests and Levites, unto whom the ministers of the New do now succeed; in like sort as our Lord's day hath done unto their sabbath, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, touching the vocation of the Gentiles, 'I will take of them for priests, and for Levites, saith the Lord.'

That the priests were superior to the Levites, no man doubteth: and that there was not a parity, either betwixt the priests or betwixt the Levites themselves, is manifest by the word of God; wherein mention is made of the heads and rulers both of the one, and of the other."¹⁰

It is also derived in part from the imitation of it brought in by the apostles, and confirmed by Christ Himself in the time of the New Testament - for, according to Ussher's exegesis, the stars in the right hand of our Lord in the Book of Revelation are bishops.

"Those things saith he, that hath the seven stars.' He owneth then, we see, these stars, whatsoever they be; and, the mystery of them he thus further openeth unto his beloved disciple: 'The seven stars, which thou sawest in my right hand, are the angels of the seven churches.' From which words a learned man, very much devoted to the now so highly admired discipline, deduceth this conclusion: 'How great, therefore, is the dignity of true pastors, who are both STARS, fixed in no other firmament than in the right hand of Christ, and ANGELS?'"¹¹

The contrary view that the stars were the presbyterate he vehemently rejects.¹² Speaking of the Church of Ephesus in particular he continues -

"And that there was then a standing president over the rest of the pastors of Ephesus, and he the very same (as learned Doctor Rainolds addeth) with him whom afterward the fathers called bishop, may further be made manifest, not only by the succession of the first bishops of that church, but also by the clear testimony of Ignatius; who, within no greater compass of time than twelve years afterwards, distinguisheth the singular and constant president thereof, from the rest of the number of the presbyters, by appropriating the name of bishop unto him." ¹³

Ussher skilfully draws out the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers, showing, too, the value attached by the earliest catholic writers to the successions of bishops - Ignatius,¹⁴ Polycarp,¹⁵ Papias,¹⁶ Justin Martyr,¹⁷ Dionysius,¹⁸ Hegesippus,¹⁹ Irenaeus,²⁰ Tertullian,²¹ Polycrates,²² Clement.²³

An interesting feature of the discussion is his contention that the seven churches of the Book of Revelation were metropolitan sees - thus tracing the beginnings of provincial jurisdictions back to the earliest days of the church.

"So that in all reason we are to suppose, that these seven churches, comprising all the rest within them, were not bare parochial ones, or so many particular congregations, but diocesan churches, as we use to call them, if not metropolitanical rather." ²⁴

These extracts may serve to show the strong defence of Episcopacy made by Ussher - for, like Stillingfleet and Taylor, while willing to accommodate, he was yet an ardent exponent of his own polity.

A second tract of our author, published also in 1641, was entitled "The Judgment of Doctor Rainoldes touching the Original of Episcopacy more largely confirmed out of Antiquity." This judgment was very much to the mind of Ussher. There is no need, however, to describe our author's reinforcement, the ground covered being very similar to the "Original." ²⁵

The most famous document by far for our purpose, however, was the "Reduction", to the genesis of which we may now direct ourselves.

In 1640, it appears, Ussher had prepared a draft of a modified scheme of Episcopacy. This draft was stolen and surreptitiously printed (1641, 4to, and again 1642, 4to) under the title - the misleading title - "The directions of the Archbishop of Armagh concerning the Liturgy and episcopal government." Instead, however, of putting forth his own edition the Primate obtained an order (9 Feb. 1640-1) of the House of Commons suppressing the pamphlet. All the same, Whitelocke's mention would seem to suggest that the scheme had been presented in some authoritative form or other.

"The Commons had Debate about a new Form of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; and July 17 agreed, That every Shire should be a several Diocess, a Presbytery of twelve Divines in each Shire, and a President as a Bishop over them; and he with assistance of some of the Presbytery, to ordain, suspend, deprive, degrade and excommunicate. To have a Diocesan Synod once a Year, and every third Year a National Synod, and they to make Canons, but none to be binding, till confirmed by Parliament. The Primate of Armagh offered an Expedient for Conjunction in Point of Discipline, that Episcopal and Presbyterial Government might not be at a far distance, but reducing Episcopacy to the form of Synodical Government in the ancient Church."²⁶

Another surreptitious edition, with a more correct title was issued in 1656 - after Ussher's death, the original eventually being published, from the author's autograph, with his 'last correction', by Nicholas Bernard, D.D., in 1657. (Later chaplain and almoner to Oliver Cromwell). The title was "The Reduction of Episcopacy unto the form of Synodical Government, received in the /

the Ancient Church: proposed in the year 1641, as an expedient for the prevention of those troubles, which afterwards did arise about the matter of Church-Government."²⁷ The text, as actually presented in 1641, can be found in "Reliquiae Baxterianae", 1696, ii. 238 seq. - where the bracketed amendments, as suggested by Richard Holdsworth, were afterwards adopted by Ussher. The marginalia, too, showing parallels with the Scottish system, of great interest, indeed, we shall have occasion to comment upon later. They were Ussher's own - he had, however, forbidden Bernard to print them. The 1660 reprint has a careless title page but follows the original in every material respect. John Hoornbeek, Utrecht, edited a Latin version in 1661.²⁸

And now let us turn to a brief outline of the "Reduction". Prefaced is a section entitled "Episcopal and Presbyterial Government conjoined" where the author maintains that all Presbyters possess a share in the discipline of the Church.²⁹ In the Church of Ephesus, he argues, in the apostolic age of the many Presbyters, there was one who was President.

"Of the many elders, who in common thus ruled the church of Ephesus, there was one president, whom our Saviour in his epistle unto this church in a peculiar manner stileth 'the angel of the Church of Ephesus.'" ³⁰

Citations are then made from Ignatius of Antioch,³¹ Tertullian³² and Cyprian³³ to show that the chief President, or Bishop, in the early Church ruled, "in matters of ecclesiastical judicature", always in consultation with the Presbyters.

"The presence of the clergy being thought to be so requisite in matters of episcopal audience, that in the fourth council of Carthage it was concluded, 'That the bishop might hear /

hear no man's cause without the presence of the clergy: and that otherwise the bishop's sentence should be void, unless it were confirmed by the presence of the clergy." ³⁴

Ussher admitted that the Church of England in this respect had wandered far from the practice of the Early Church.

"True it is, that in our Church this kind of presbyterial government hath been long disused, yet seeing it still professeth that every pastor hath a right to rule the church (from whence the name of rector also was given at first unto him) and to administer the discipline of Christ, as well as to dispense the doctrine and sacraments, and the restraint of the exercise of that right proceedeth only from the custom now received in this realm; no man can doubt, but by another law of the land, this hindrance may be well removed. And how easily this ancient form of government by the united suffrages of the clergy might be revived again, and with what little shew of alteration the synodical conventions of the pastors of every parish might be accorded with the presidency of the bishops of each diocese and province, the indifferent reader may quickly perceive by the perusal of the ensuing propositions." ³⁵

And so follows the famous plan - "How the Church might synodically be governed, archbishops and bishops being still retained" - the terms of which are so important that we must reproduce it in its entirety.

I.

In every parish, the rector, or incumbent pastor, together with the church-wardens and sidesmen, may every week take notice of such as live scandalously in that congregation, who are to receive such several admonitions and reproofs, as the quality of their offence shall deserve; and if by this means they cannot be reclaimed, they may be presented to the next monthly synod; and in the mean time debarred by the pastor from access unto the Lord's table.

II.

Whereas by a statute in the six and twentieth year of King Henry the eighth, revived in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, suffragans are appointed to be erected in twenty six /

six several places of this kingdom; the number of them might very well be conformed unto the number of the several rural deaneries, into which every diocese is subdivided; which being done, the suffragan supplying the place of those, who in the ancient church were called chorepiscopi, might every month assemble a synod of all the rectors, or incumbent pastors within the precinct, and according to the major part of their voices, conclude all matters that shall be brought in to debate before them.

To this synod the rector and church-wardens might present such impenitent persons, as by admonitions and suspension from the sacrament would not be reformed; who if they should still remain contumacious and incorrigible, the sentence of excommunication might be decreed against them by the synod, and accordingly be executed in the parish where they lived. Hitherto also all things that concerned the parochial ministers might be referred, whether they did touch their doctrine, or their conversation, as also the censure of all new opinions, heresies, and schisms, which did arise within that circuit; with liberty of appeal, if need so require, unto the diocesan synod.

III.

The diocesan synod might be held once or twice in the year, as it should be thought most convenient: therein all the suffragans, and the rest of the rectors, or incumbent pastors, or a certain select number of every deanery within the diocese, might meet, with whose consent, or the major part of them, all things might be concluded by the bishop, or superintendent, call him whether you will, or in his absence, by one of the suffragans; whom he shall depute in his stead to be moderator of that assembly.

Here all matters of greater moment might be taken into consideration, and the orders of the monthly synods revised, and, if need be, reformed: and if here also any matter of difficulty could not receive a full determination, it might be referred to the next provincial, or national synod.

IV.

The provincial synod might consist of all the bishops and suffragans, and such other of the clergy as should be elected out of every diocese within the province; the archbishop of either province might be the moderator of this meeting, or in his room some one of the bishops appointed by him, and all matters be ordered therein by common consent as in the former assemblies.

This synod might be held every third year, and if the parliament do then sit, according to the act of a triennial parliament, /

parliament, both the archbishops and provincial synods of the land might join together, and make up a national council: wherein all appeals from inferior synods might be received, all their acts examined and all ecclesiastical constitutions which concern the state of the church of the whole nation established. ³⁶

Appended is the judgment of Archbishop Ussher and of Dr. Holdsworth that the suffragans, mentioned in Section II. "may lawfully use the power both of jurisdiction and ordination according to the Word of God, and the practice of the Ancient Church."

Here was a deliberate attempt to unite the essential features of the Presbyterian discipline with a modification of the episcopate. In I., for example, the rector or incumbent, with churchwardens and sidesmen, we see the answer to the Presbyterian Kirk Session, in II., the rural deanery with its suffragans and all ministers of the precinct (deanery), the Presbyterian Presbytery, in III., the Diocesan Synod, with suffragans and select numbers of the deanery rectors, the Presbyterian Synod, and lastly in IV., the Provincial Synod, with its Diocesan Bishops and suffragans and the selected clergy of the diocese, the Presbyterian General Assembly. In addition, the two provincial Synods, Canterbury and York, could form a National Council.

I. was to meet weekly and be presided over by the rector or incumbent, II. monthly, the suffragan presiding, (the $\chi\omega\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$ of the Early Church), III. once or twice yearly under the presidency of the Bishop (or Superintendent) and in his absence by one of the suffragans deputed for the task, and IV. every third year, the Archbishop of either province presiding and in his absence an appointed Bishop.

The /

The very noticeable pliability of the offices of bishop and presbyter in this scheme can be largely accounted for by Ussher's somewhat pliant views. Says Elrington -

"Dr. Bernard relates a correspondence with the Archbishop, which gives a much more correct statement of his views, and proves that the difficulty, which embarrassed him, was the validity of the orders in the Continental churches. The Primate was most determined in upholding their validity, and hence was led to lower his doctrine of episcopacy as far as was possible and perhaps farther than was consistent with his upholding its apostolical origin. Dr. Bernard states, that a report was circulated of the Primate having given an unfavourable judgment of the ordination beyond the sea, founded on the following statement: 'Mr. ---- asked the Archbishop of Armagh on occasion of an ordination, what he thought of them that were ordained by Presbyters; he said he judged their ordination to be null, and looked on them as laymen. He asked him what he conceived of the Churches beyond the sea. The Bishop answered he had charitable thoughts of them in France: but as for Holland he questioned if there was a church amongst them or not; or words to that purpose: this Dr. ---- confidently reports.' The paper containing this statement was forwarded to the Primate by Dr. Bernard, who gives the following extracts from his Grace's answer; it is unfortunate and rather extraordinary that he did not give the whole letter: 'Touching Mr. ---- I cannot call to mind that he ever proposed to me the question in your letter enclosed, neither do I know the Dr. who hath spread the report; but for the matter itself, I have ever declared my opinion to be that Episcopus et Presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine, and consequently that in places where Bishops cannot be had, the ordination of Presbyters standeth valid: yet on the other side holding as I do, that a Bishop hath a superiority in degree over a Presbyter, you may easily judge that the ordination made by such Presbyters, as have severed themselves from those Bishops, unto whom they had sworn canonical obedience, cannot possibly by me be excused from being schismatical; and howsoever I must needs think that the Churches, which have no Bishops, are thereby become very much defective in their government, and that the Churches in France, who living under a popish power cannot do what they would, are more excusable in this defect than the Low Countries, that live under a free state, yet for testifying my communion with these churches (which I do love and honour as true members of the Church Universal) I do professe that with like affection I should receive the blessed Sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers, if I were in Holland, as I should do at the hands of the French ministers if I were in Charentone.'" ³⁷

The 'gradus tantum' sentence, assuredly, was a big concession, a concession for which Ussher was fiercely assailed by Heylin, Laud's chaplain and biographer, in his "Respondet Petrus".³⁸ To this an answer was made by Ussher's own chaplain and biographer, Dr. Richard Parr, and given as an 'Appendix' to his 'Life'. The 'gradus tantum' sentence, he confesses, he could not deny.

"Which Opinion as I cannot deny to have been my Lord Primat's, since I find the same written almost verbatim with his own hand, (dated Nov. 26. 1655, in a private Note-Book) not many months before his death, with the addition of this clause at the beginning, viz. Yet, on the other side, holding as I do, That a Bishop hath superiority in degree above Presbyters, you may easily judg that the Ordination made by such Presbyters as have severed themselves from their Bishops, cannot possibly by me be excused from being schismatical. And concluding with another clause, viz. for the agreement or disagreement in radical and fundamental Doctrines; not the consonancy, or dissonancy in the particular points of Ecclesiastical Government is with me (and I hope with every man that mindeth Peace) the rule of adhering to, or receding from the Communion of any Church. And that the Lord Primate was always of this Opinion, I find by another Note of his own hand, written in another Book many years before this, in these words, viz. The intrinsecal power of Ordaining proceedeth not from Jurisdiction, but also from Order. But a Presbyter hath the same Order in specie with a Bishop; Ergo, A Presbyter hath equally an intrinsecal power to give Orders; and is equal to him in the power of Order; the Bishop having no higher degree in respect of intension, or extention of the character of Order; tho he hath an higher degree, i.e. a more eminent place in respect of Authority and Jurisdiction in Spiritual Regiment. Again, The Papists teach that the confirmation of the Baptized is proper to a Bishop, as proceeding from the Episcopal Character as well as Ordination: and yet in some cases may be communicated to a Presbyter, and much more therefore in regard of the over-ruling Commands of invincible necessity, although the right of Baptising was given by Christ's own Commission to the Apostles, and their Successors; and yet in case of Necessity allowed to Lay-men: even so Ordination might be devolved to Presbyters in case of Necessity."³⁹

Parr clearly sees the objection that much of this was against the teaching of the "Original" - necessity, however, knows no law.

"And /

"And that this may very well consist with their being in some cases of Necessity, not absolutely necessary in some Churches, is proved by the Learned Mr. Mason, in his defence of the Ordination of Ministers beyond the Seas, where there are no Bishops, in which he proves at large against the Papists, that make this Objection from their own Schoolmen and Canonists; 'and that tho a Bishop receives a Sacred Office, Eminency in Degree, and a larger Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction than a Presbyter, yet that all these do not confer an absolute distinct Order; and yet that Bishops are still Jure Divino, that is, by the Ordinance of God, since they were ordained by the Apostles, and whereunto they were directed by God's Holy Spirit, and in that sence are the Ordinance of God. But if by Jure Divino, you would understand a Law binding all Christian Churches universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute Necessity that no other form of Regiment may in any case be admitted, in this sence we cannot grant it to be Jure Divino.' And much of the same Opinion is the Learned Bishop Davenant in his Treatise." 40

Parr is of the opinion that the issue is not an important one, a logomachy in fact.

"So that I hope after all, this question, whether Episcopacy be Ordo, or Gradus, will prove only a difference in words rather than substance, between those of the Lord Primat's Judgment, and those of the contrary, since they are both agreed in the main Points in controversie between them and the Presbyterians, viz. That Bishops were ordained in the Church by the Apostles themselves, from the direction or at least approbation of our Saviour himself, being the Stars which St. John saw in his Vision in our Lord Christ's own Hand, and that they are permanent, immutable Officers in the Church, which cannot subsist without it, but in Cases of pure Necessity. And lastly, that those Presbyters, which in Churches founded and settled with Bishops, do separate from them, are guilty of Schism. These things being agreed upon on both sides, I think the rest of the Controversie is not worth contending about." 41

This slight - but necessary - digression will serve to show how Ussher's somewhat pliant views of the offices of bishop and presbyter largely account for the marked pliability of the "Reduction." 42

At the same time, there were limits to his concessions, two observations /

observations falling to be made -

I. It is not maintained that the bishop should not be specially consecrated to his office.

II. No suggestion is mooted that the presbytery could ordain without the bishop. (Parr. Life of Usher. Pages 67 and 68).

Limits there were to what could be conceded, these being the limits. Indeed, many were of the opinion he had conceded too much. Says Collier -

"But the warmth of his affection to the Protestant interest in general, and his zeal for a close correspondence between all the reformed Churches, made him depart a little from the primitive government, give too great an allowance to the Presbyterian scheme, and qualify the episcopal jurisdiction too much in favour of the schismatics." ⁴³

That, however, was an extreme view. If Ussher's scheme was to be unacceptable - as, indeed, it turned out to be - it is certainly difficult to see what plan could have been substituted for it - a plan, which, at any rate, would be sincere in its loyalty both to Episcopalian and Presbyterian principles. The most obvious criticism, of course, is the absence of lay representation. Apart from the parochial body, the 'Reduction' envisaged a purely clerical organization - a weakness, too, reproduced in those, such as Leighton, who made Ussher their basis. ⁴⁴

"The accommodation", M'Ward objected, "utterly disowns and cuts off the ruling elder." ⁴⁵ In addition, the vagueness regarding the bishop's negative voice is a feature - as of practically all of the accommodation schemes ⁴⁶ - of this one too. Is it not possible, /

possible, moreover, that Hooker, had he been living, would have criticized the attempt to revert to an abandoned type, thus refusing to face the law of development?

XXXIV. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. "He was a man of a most exemplary Moderation, and Meekness, Humility, Ingenuity."
Life of Usher. Nicholas Bernard. p. 105.
- "James Ussher from his tenderest years, together with strong feelings of devotion, had manifested great intellectual powers, which were cultivated and matured by assiduous study."
Mant. History of the Church of Ireland. Vol. I. p. 331.
- "His natural endowments were so various, and so great, as seldom are to be met with in one man, viz. a Fertile Invention, a Tenacious Memory, with a Solid and well-weigh'd Judgment; whereby he was always, from a young man, presently furnished for any Exercise he was put upon, which lay within the compass of those studies he had applied himself to."
Parr. Life of Usher. p. 80.
- "Of the Primate as a man of learning it is almost unnecessary to speak; the works which he has published sufficiently attest the stupendous extent of his information, and the skill with which he could make use of the treasures he possessed, his name became celebrated throughout Europe, and his services to the cause of literature, more particularly in the departments of history and chronology, have been acknowledged by all modern writers. The panegyric of Selden has been repeated from every part of Europe: 'Jacobus Usserius, Archiepiscopus Armachanus, vir summa pietate, judicio singulari, usque ad miraculum doctus et literis severioribus promovendis natus.'"
Elrington. Ussher's Works. Vol. I. pp. 298 & 299.
2. Adair. True Narrative.
- "At their head was Ussher, learned, tolerant, and disinterested, the most distinguished ornament of his church and nation, and, as Livingston significantly adds, 'a godly man, although a bishop.'"
Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Vol. I. pp. 158 & 159.
3. Thurloe. State Papers. Vol. I. p. 112.
4. cf. Aikin. Life of Usher.
- "Bedell, however, it must be acknowledged, came nearer to what Burnet would consider as a model of the episcopal character than Usher. He performed the most arduous parts of his duty with unremitting vigour and assiduity, never deserted his flock, and died in his charge, in the hands of enemies to his faith, whom the sanctity of his manners awed into reverence. The primate, on the other hand, by his frequent absences from the scene of his principal duties, in some measure made /

made the metropolitan give way to the man of letters; and perhaps in this chiefly consisted those sins of omission which appear to have dwelt on his mind at the close of life." p. 297.

Bedell, however, did not take an active part in the accommodation movement. His interest lay in other directions. His general sympathy is referred to by Reid. History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Vol. I.

"Like Ussher, he maintained the identity of bishop and presbyter. He ordained no individual to the ministry without the consent of his clergy, whom he styled brethren and fellow-presbyters; and he deemed it irregular to exercise his episcopal functions beyond his own diocese."

p. 162. (His reference is to Burnet's Life of Bedell).

See also H.J. Monck Mason. Life of William Bedell. p. 207. D.N.B. Article "William Bedell". Vol. IV.

(J. Bass Mullinger).

"Towards the end of Strafford's government the bishop again incurred the disapproval of the authorities by a manifestation of sympathy with Adair, bishop of Killaloe, who was brought before the high commission court for expressions in favour of the covenanting party in Scotland, and in consequence deprived of his see." p. 108.

5. Ch. XXVI. of this work. p. 345 seq.

6. Adair. True Narrative. Passim.

Blair. Autobiography. Passim.

7. Ch. XXVIII. of this present work. p. 368.

8. Do. p. 367.

See also D.N.B. Article "James Ussher". (Alexander Gordon). Vol. LVIII.

"The most striking omission is the absence of reference to distinction of orders among the clergy or to any form of ordination." p. 66.

9. Elrington. Ussher's Works. Life. Vol. I.

"That which fell from me yesterday suddenly and transcursively, hath since taken up my after-midnight thoughts, and I must crave leave, what I then moved, to importune, that your Grace would be pleased to bestow one sheet of paper upon these distracted times, in the subject of Episcopacie, shewing the Apostolical original of it, and the grounds of it from Scripture, and the immediately succeeding antiquity; every line of it coming from your Grace's hand would be 'super rotas suas:' as Solomons expression is, very Apples of Gold, with Pictures of Silver, and more worth than volumes from us: Think, that I stand before you like the Man of Macedon, and that you heare me say, Come and help us." p. 225.

Ware. /

Ware.

"A.D.1641 He published a short Treatise entitled, The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans; wherein he proves from Scripture, and antient Monuments, their establishment and Succession from the Apostles, and that there was never any Christian Church founded in the Primitive Times without Bishops."

Works. Vol. I. p. 109.

Aikin. Life of Usher. p. 253.

Parr. Life of Usher. p. 44.

10. Ussher. Works. Vol. VII. p. 43.

11. Do. p. 45.

12. Do. p. 46.

13. Do. pp. 46 & 47.

14. The mention of Ignatius reminds us that Ussher was an authority on the letters. Interesting, accordingly, it is to find him here using such evidence, carefully confining, however, his quotations to the passages in which the interpolated version agrees with the genuine text.

Works. Vol. VII. pp. 48-50.

15. Works. Vol. VII. p. 50.

16. Do. p. 58.

17. Do. p. 47.

18. Do.

19. Do. p. 53.

20. Do. p. 50.

21. Do. p. 51.

22. Do.

23. Do. p. 58.

24. Do. pp. 60 & 61.

25. Do. pp. 75-85.

26. Whitelock. Memorials. p. 46.

27. Ussher's Works. Vol. XII. p. 527.

28. Its title is as follows -

"Jacobi Usserii Armachani, De Reductione Episcopatus, ad formam regiminis Synodici, in antiqua Ecclesia recepti. Cum Notis."

The notes are most interesting, especially those on the equation of the episcopate and the presbyterate.

e.g. pp. 24, 26 & 52.

29. Ussher's Works. Vol. XII. p. 531.

30. Do.

31. Do. p. 532.

32. Do.

33. Do. p. 533.

34. Do.

35. Do.

36. Do. pp. 534-536.

37. Do. Vol. I. pp. 258-260.

cf. W.F. Hook.

"He was embarrassed in maintaining the cause of episcopacy, /

episcopacy, without denying the validity of the orders of continental Churches; hence he was led to lower his doctrine of episcopacy as far as was possible, and perhaps farther than was consistent with his upholding its apostolical origin." pp. 608 & 609. Ecclesiastical Biography. Vol. VIII.

38. Aikin. Life. p. 303.
39. Parr. Life of Usher. Appendix. p. 6.
40. Do. p. 7.
Baxter refers to the inconsistency of the "Reduction" and the "Original" in Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 244.
41. Parr. Life of Usher. pp. 7 & 8.
42. According to Baxter Ussher admitted that presbyters had ordained bishops.
"I asked him also his Judgment about the validity of Presbyters Ordination; which he asserted, and told me, that the King asked him at the Isle of Wight, wherever he found in Antiquity that Presbyters alone ordained any? and that he answered, I can shew your Majesty more, even where Presbyters alone successively ordained Bishops; and instanced in Hierom's Words Epist. ad Evagrium, of the Presbyters of Alexandria choosing and making their own Bishops from the Days of Mark, till Heraclius and Dionysius. I asked him also whether the Paper be his that is called (A Reduction of Episcopacy to the Form of Synodical Government) which he owned; and Dr. Bernard after witnessed to be his."
Reliquiae Baxterianae. Lib. I. Part II. p. 206.
Elrington vehemently denies this. Ussher's Works. Vol. I. p. 257.
43. Collier. Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain. Vol. 8. pp. 375 & 376.
44. D.N.B. Article "James Ussher". (Alexander Gordon). Vol. LVIII.
"His reduction of Episcopacy took no account of the real difficulty, the lay demand for a voice in church affairs." p. 70.
45. Ante. pp. 164 & 167.
46. Ante. p. 157.
Parr. Life of Usher. p. 67.

JAMES USSHER - 1648.

In the previous chapter we examined Ussher's "Reduction", seeing in it one of the most memorable contributions to the accommodationist literature of the seventeenth century. It now falls to us to examine briefly its influence, together with the part it played in the history of its time - and this by way of recapitulation, as we have already traced it in the many English accommodations, as well as in Leighton's Scottish scheme. Not only is it directly named in very many of these comprehensive attempts throughout the greater part of the century but it is often plainly present even when unmentioned.

In a committee of the Long Parliament, as we have already seen, Sir Edward Deering obviously was under Ussher's influence in pleading his own scheme. ¹ The plan of Bishop Williams of Lincoln, too, has strong affinities with Ussher's ideas. ² No doubt during the early sessions of the Westminster Assembly the "Reduction" was known only in a surreptitious form yet that it was known cannot be denied. (To his influence in that famous gathering we have already had occasion to refer. ³)

At the Isle of Wight accommodation of 1648 it was that the "Reduction" first came into high prominence. (We have, however, already given the narrative of these negotiations ⁴ and need not repeat it. Suffice it to say that the "Reduction" was pleasing to Presbyterians and King alike, the latter not only consenting to /

to the Primate's plan but offering to suspend, in addition, the exercise of Episcopal government for three years - after which time no power of ordination was to be exercised by the Bishops without the consent of the Presbyters. Neither would any other Episcopal jurisdiction be exercised, except such as should be agreed upon by the King and the Two Houses of Parliament.⁵ The Parliamentary Commissioners, however, being bent on the abolition of Episcopacy, the plan, as we have seen, came to nought.

To the criticism that Ussher had lowered the status of the Episcopal order his apologists had their answer. Says Parr, for example -

"To vindicate the Lord Primate from which imputation, I desire them to consider these particulars; first, the time when this Expedient was proposed, viz. When his Majesty had already consented to the suspension of Episcopal Government for three years absolutely, as also for settling Presbytery in the room of it for that time, and for quite taking away Arch-Bishops, Deans and Chapters, &c. (as hath been already said,) whereas the Lord Primate's Expedient proposes none of these, but supposes the Arch-Bishops, or Primates ought to be continued."⁶

Ware defends in similar terms,⁷ as also Aikin.⁸

Although the "Reduction", however, received no success in the Newport negotiations it did not cease to exercise influence in the years that followed. We see it, for example, in the correspondence - suggested by Vine - between Baxter and Bishop Brownrig,⁹ the former's scheme of parochial bodies, Classes and Provincial Assemblies being obviously indebted to Ussher. Baxter's subsequent scheme, too, submitted to Ussher and commended by him was along similar lines.¹⁰

The attraction of the "Reduction", we know, continued through the /

the Restoration period, men still hankering after its ideals. Indeed, to Charles, in 1660, the Presbyterians made it the basis of their offer.¹¹ The terms, also, of the Sion College scheme, (as we have seen,) included the "Reduction".¹² No doubt the bishops in their reply asserted that "Archbishop Usher's model" was "not consistent with his other learned discourses on the original of episcopacy, and of metropolitans; nor with the king's supremacy in causes ecclesiastical"¹³ nevertheless the "Reduction" continued to be the subject of discussion. Indeed, following upon the Worcester House Declaration, the offer was renewed.¹⁴

As the century advanced, however, less mention - naturally enough - was made, though from time to time the scheme came in for comment, embodying, as it did, an ideal which died hard. Hale, a leading figure in the Wilkins-Burton Accommodation, as we have seen, was a friend of Ussher as well as of Baxter.¹⁵ In 1673, indeed, we find the last named still pleading for the "Reduction"¹⁶ - thereafter, having played so glorious a part, it gradually fell out of view.

In Scotland, as we have witnessed, the Leighton Accommodation had been based on Ussher, the "Reduction" dominating the Restoration schemes both in that land and in England. Why the scheme failed we have already studied in the appropriate place.)¹⁷

Surely, then, the widespread influence of (the "Reduction") in both Scotland and England was a tribute to the greatest accommodationist of his generation. He failed. It is hardly likely, however, that anyone else in the circumstances would have succeeded.

The /

The time was not yet. Toleration was possible without accommodation - as witness King William's experience - but accommodation, assuredly, was not possible without toleration. And real toleration in the seventeenth century was slow in coming to the birth. Surely, however, the long accommodationist discussion was not altogether fruitless. Says Russell Smith -

"It helped men to understand the reasonableness of the various opinions with which they could not agree. This by no means makes persecution impossible. Men persecute for opinions which they consider reasonable but wrong. Nevertheless it made toleration easier. Discussions of Comprehension can never make men believe in the right to differ; but they may produce a recognition of the reasonableness of differing. It is necessary to make the further assumption that what is reasonable is right. Any particular belief may not be right to everybody; but those who believe it have a right to retain their belief. Viewed in this light discussions on comprehension are only one step towards a belief in toleration. That was their value." ¹⁸

And now our study comes to a conclusion. Looking back over the way we have travelled certain indelible impressions remain. We are struck, for example, by the keen appreciation of the Catholicism of the Church which the accommodationists entertained - and who could describe it more eloquently than they? We are struck, too, by their deep sense of the scandal and shame of the divided Church, the broken body of Christ in the world. Baxter, Ussher, Taylor, Stillingfleet - all alike - they gave utterance to a heart-rending cry of dismay that it should be so. How the dark spectre of schism, too, haunted their hearts and prompted them to action! Their innate optimism, their willingness to see and assess the views of others, their refusal to be discouraged, their persistency in their ideals command our unstinted admiration.

Alas. /

Alas, their problem is still with us. A knowledge of their place in history, however, should surely help us in these present days.

Our final and fitting word, accordingly, is to repeat the last sentence of Stillingfleet's Irenicum¹⁹ -

'I conclude all with this earnest desire, That the Wise and Gracious God would send us one heart and one way, that he would be the Composer of our differences, and the repairer of our breaches, that of our strange divisions and unchristian animosities, while we pretend to serve the Prince of peace, we may at last see

T H E E N D.'

XXXV. SOURCES and AUTHORITIES.

1. Ante. p. 210.
2. Do. p. 211.
3. Do. pp. 237 & 238.
4. Do. p. 227 seq.
5. Do. p. 229 seq.
- Parr. Life of Usher. p. 66.
- Neal. History of the Puritans. Vol. III. pp. 434 &
435.
- Rushworth. Part IV. Vol. II. pp. 1321 & 1322.
6. Parr. Life of Usher. p. 67.
7. Ware. Works. Vol. I. p. 113.
8. Aikin. Life of Usher. p. 281.
9. This work. See pp. 280 & 281.
10. Do. p. 281.
11. Do. p. 290.
12. Do. p. 291 seq.
13. Do. p. 295.
14. Do. p. 300.
15. Do. pp. 310 & 311.
16. Do. p. 320.
17. Do. p. 166 seq.
18. Russell Smith. Religious Liberty under Charles II. and
James II. p. 96.
19. Stillingfleet. The Irenicum. p. 416.